

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, March, 1898.

THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

THE Modern Language Association of America held its fifteenth annual meeting Dec. 27-29, at the University of Pennsylvania. The programme included an afternoon and evening session on Dec. 27th, a morning and afternoon session Dec. 28th, and a morning session Dec. 29th. By courtesy of the officers of the Houston Club, the auditorium of Houston Hall was used as the official headquarters of the Association.

The Association was called to order by the President, Professor Albert S. Cook of Yale University. The reports of the Secretary, Professor James W. Bright, and of the Treasurer, Professor Herbert E. Greene, both of Johns Hopkins University, having been received, and other routine business disposed of, the first paper of the session upon "The New Requirements in Entrance English" was read by Professor T. W. Hunt of Princeton University. This paper will appear later in full in the columns of this Journal.

The second paper was by Professor Henry Wood of Johns Hopkins University upon "The close of Goethe's *Tasso* as a literary problem," of which the following is an abstract.

Speculations as to Tasso's future, drawn from the play itself, Professor Wood said, are nugatory. Biographical side-lights, based on the equation Goethe-Tasso and Frau von Stein-Princess Leonore, will always retain a certain shifting but real interest, defying precise statement though never to be denied. But Leonore of Este is a pietist of the renaissance, a character foreign to Frau von Stein. Goethe fixed the type of the pietistic grand lady in his *Wilhelm Meister*. It is found in the Countess, her family and environment. This character, conceived and worked out for the novel during the years of Goethe's initial interest in Tasso (1781-83), represents a new

creation in literature. It became at once the literary prototype of Princess Leonore in the drama.

Both the Princess and Wilhelm's Countess are "schöne Seelen," revealing the "grosse Welt" to their lovers, who worship them from afar with "stille Neigung." Each author is admitted to the boudoir, to recite his productions. Mistaking tender sympathy for complaisance, each surprises his lady and himself into a wild embrace. Brought to his senses by the womanly and resolute "Hinweg!" each hears with despair the rumble of the carriage wheels bearing his injured patroness away from the rural retreat, with no farewell said.

Both Princess Leonore and the Countess, 'sick and lost to this world,' sink into a condition of tender melancholy and pietistic inertia. In the one case the influence proceeds from Herrnhut, in the other from "die Stillen im Lande," who give character to the 'evangelical renaissance' at the Court of Ferrara. This entirely new view of Leonore's surroundings and character is abundantly confirmed by the indirect evidence contained in books like Jules Bonnet's *Aonio Paleario* and *Olympia Morata*, and Benrath's *Bernhardino Ochino*. Leonore of Este in the play is the pietistic German "Weltdame," with an Italian coloring. The early part of *Wilhelm Meister* is a character study for the drama. Goethe's Princess represents in a dramatic figure the consummate unification of what in the novel was still a complex type, appearing in the "schöne Seele" of the *Confessions*, and her two nieces, the Countess and Natalie.

The same result was achieved in the case of the minor characters. The Baroness in *Wilhelm Meister* is a rudimentary sketch of Leonore of Sanvitale, the "verschmitzte kleine Mittlerin" of Tasso's unjust accusations. Jarno is an equally unmistakable, though fragmentary, study for the character of Antonio.

By vouchsafing a future to Wilhelm, rescuing him 'so as by fire,' Goethe has in a certain sense granted both hero and heroine in *Tasso* a new existence under more favorable conditions. Not Tasso reappears but his German counterpart, the defeated lover of a second

Leonore, who this time wins in his conflict with the world, for himself and for his "schöne Seele." Goethe is not satisfied until the literary characters that owe their origin to his own experiences have been allotted in his works the full measure of a rounded life. What they thus lose in dramatic intensity, they gain as examples of the fulness and complexity of modern culture.

The results of the present study are claimed to be: first, proof of a close connection in character and incident between *Tasso* and the early chapters of *Wilhelm Meister*; second, the establishment of complete literary identity between Goethe's pietistic "Weltdamen" in the novel and his Princess Leonore of Este as the literary centre of the evangelical mystical renaissance at Ferrara; third, the substitution in one instance of a new canon of the survival and development of literary types in Goethe, in place of the shifting and evanescent personal types hitherto assumed.

The paper which was to follow, by Dr. Thérèse F. Colin of Bryn Mawr College, upon "The phraseology of Molière's *Précieuses Ridicules* historically considered," was not read, but a brief abstract may be given here. Molière was charged by his contemporaries with having grossly satirized the *Précieuses* and with having made his characters use extravagant language of his own invention. The purpose of the paper was to determine how much truth there was in this assertion. From a study of the writers of the time, Dr. Colin has sought to define the language of the *Précieuses*, to note its sources and the ridiculous abuse into which its imitation led, finding, it would seem for Molière's justification, a sufficient number of parallel passages which may have furnished him with the very expressions so bitterly criticized in 1659 when the play was first performed.

The fourth paper by Professor John E. Matzke of Leland Stanford Junior University upon "The question of free and checked vowels in Gallic Popular Latin," was to have been read by Professor L. E. Menger of Bryn Mawr University, but Professor Menger in view of the difficulty of presenting the paper in detail properly, gave instead a summary of Dr. Matzke's views, and a statement regarding his own position as at variance with and as criticized by Professor Matzke.

The main point of Dr. Matzke's paper was that a definition of the terms "free" and "checked" must be based on the forms of words as existing in Popular Latin. The vowels in these words developed according to a principle elaborated by ten Brink: all vowels in open syllables, not already long, become lengthened, all vowels in closed syllables, not already short, become shortened. The time for the action of this law has been determined by Pogatscher and Mackel to be the sixth century. Therefore, the definition of "free" and "checked" must be restricted to the forms of words as existing at this date.

Dr. Menger, in his remarks on the paper, suggested that it is probably impossible to make any general statement of the question that will include all cases of vowel development in French. The nearest approach to such a statement is that of Schwan-Behrens. He said that in the sixth century only *e* and *o* had developed. The other vowels did not begin to develop until the eighth century. When they did develop they did so as influenced by consonantal conditions of the latter century without regard to the sixth. If we limit our definition to this century we exclude the influence of palatals, which, for the most part did not begin altering until after this date. He asked if we are not interested in causes that really did determine the fate of vowels, rather than in their condition at a time when they had not altered materially or in all cases, so far as we can judge, from the value they possessed even in Classical Latin.

Dr. Menger questioned the justice of restricting the action of ten Brink's law to the sixth century; he understood it as referring to a general tendency in Romance, that was apt to manifest itself during any of the centuries of the formative period. Dr. Menger stated his belief that if we wish a statement that will cover all cases at all times, we shall have to vary the statement according to the cases and the times; that is, the question is a chronological one, and its full determination must probably go hand in hand with the separate determination of the first indications of change on the part of each vowel. In controlling the dates of such changes, the most important aid will be found in comparing the one with the alterations of the palatals, and until the exact stages and times of the de-

velopments of the latter are known, further advance in our knowledge of Old French vowel developments is hardly to be hoped for.

The next paper was by Professor Felix E. Schelling of the University of Pennsylvania upon "Ben Jonson and the Classical School." Starting with the antithetical terms "romantic" and "classical," and affirming the co-existence of both classic and romantic art in all ages, as elements of differing intensity, Professor Schelling pointed out three manifestations of the classical spirit in literature in the period from the Renaissance to the reign of Queen Anne. These are 1. the empirical classicism of Sir Philip Sidney, busy with externals such as theorizing upon the Greek unities, and the introduction of classical measures into English verse; 2. the assimilative classicism of Ben Jonson, based on that poet's temperament and deep scholarship; and 3. the pseudo- or conventionalized classicism of Alexander Pope.

A contrast was then drawn between the manner of Spenser, that is, Spenser's way of imitating and interpreting nature artistically by means of poetic expression, and the manner of Jonson. Spenser was chosen as the representative, as he was the leader of a large school of poets, his contemporaries and successors, and his manner was described in brief as consisting of a sensuous love of beauty involving the power of pictorial representation, a use of classical imagery for decorative effect, a fondness for melody of a flowing sweetness and continuousness of diction, involving at times diffuseness. In contrast the manner of Jonson displays a sense for form, a sense of finish, reserve and self-control. In a word, the antithesis between the two poets is that of romanticism and classicality.

This was followed by a discussion of Jonson's relations to his time especially in his literary dictatorship. It was shown that the subject matter of Jonson's non-dramatic verse contains practically all the varieties of poetry subsequently practised by Dryden and Pope. It was established that 1. Jonson wielded the greatest literary influence of his time; 2. that this influence was exerted chiefly upon the scholarly and cultivated classes; 3. that this influence extended until long after the Restoration; 4. that it made directly for the classical ideal and lasted while that ideal

lasted. A brief enumeration then followed of existing theories set forth to explain the origin of the transformation that came over English Literature between the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and Queen Anne. It was urged that while the form of versification was of value in indicating the nature of this change, weight must be given to many other considerations.

The second part of this paper was devoted to a discussion of the thesis that not a trait which came to prevail in the poetry of the new classical school can be found that is not directly traceable to the influence and example of Ben Jonson. Attention was called to the attitude of Jonson toward the prevalent literary taste of his age, his contempt for popular judgment, his criticism of his contemporaries (Sidney and Spenser among them) and his objection in general to the romanticism of his day. This position was explained as that of a professional man who had a theory to oppose to the amateurishness and eclecticism of his time. In this respect Jonson's position was stated to be much that of Matthew Arnold in his exclamation: "Amid the bewildering confusion of our times I seemed to myself to find the only sure guidance, the only solid-footing among the ancients." Some of Ben Jonson's theories which betray the classicist were then set forth,—his belief in the rhetoric of Quintilian and in the criticism of Horace, his conviction that English drama must follow the ancients; but these theories were shown to be none the less reasonable and liberal, and his position in general that of a man desirous of applying the canons of the past to conditions which he recognized as different in the present. The restrictions of classicality in practice as contrasted with matters of theory were then considered: among them Jonson's tendency to precise and pointed antithetical diction, his slightly Latinized vocabulary, his occasional preference for abstract over concrete expression, and his somewhat conventionalized metrical form. His practice in this last particular was shown to be entirely in accordance with his theories expressed in his conversations with Drummond, and elsewhere. It was shown that in Jonson's non-dramatic verse the decasyllabic rhymed couplet is all but his constant measure, that in his hands it became the habitual measure for occasional verse, and sanctioned by his usage, remained

such for one hundred and fifty years. It was shown that not only did Jonson's practice and theory thus coincide, but also that the practice of no other poet exemplified like characteristics to anything approaching the same extent until we pass beyond the accession of Charles I.

Illustrations were then given to show the nature of the versification of several poets preceding and contemporary with Jonson. The results of this consideration, [which cannot be given here] show first, a gradual decrease in the number of run-on couplets and run-on lines through Spenser, through Jonson and Dryden to Pope, but they showed also a division of these six poets into two groups with respect to the use and non-use of the continuous line: Sandys, contrary to the usual theory on this subject, showing a close affiliation to the manner of Spenser, and Jonson falling into a group which includes Waller, Dryden, and Pope. A further examination into Jonson's use of antithesis and into other devices of the later classical manner shows that he contained in his versification, as in his style and in his theory, all those qualities which developed to a greater degree came finally to characterize the style and versification of the so called "Classical Age;" and moreover that this could be affirmed of no other poet contemporary with Jonson's earlier career.

In conclusion, attention was called to the liberality of Jonson's spirit despite his own strong preferences, and to the eclecticism of his practice which had much to do, with other influences, in delaying the coming of the following age of restriction. This is especially exemplified in Jonson's two disciples: Robert Herrick and Edmund Waller. Both owed much to Jonson, but Waller especially carried on the classical spirit in the lyric which he impoverished and conventionalized, and in occasional verse, for which he possessed a peculiar talent.

Professor W. T. Hewett of Cornell University then spoke upon "The sources of Goethe's printed text," and upon that of *Hermann und Dorothea* in particular. He first presented a history of the various collected editions of Goethe's works. Starting with the statement that Goedeke in his *Deutsche Dichtung* (1843) was one of the first to call attention to errors in Goethe's printed text, he reviewed the ser-

vices of Professor M. Bernays in tracing the numerous corruptions in the earlier writings, especially in *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers*, *Götz von Berlichingen*, *Stella* and *Clavigo*, to the unauthorized Himgurg editions. The efforts of Seuffert in the *Goethe Jahrbuch*, vol. xv, to determine the relation of the Stuttgart to the Vienna edition of Goethe's *Werke*, B and B', as illustrated in a study of Goethe's "Erzählung," *Die Guten Weiber*, were examined. After showing that a uniform law for the protection of literary property did not exist in Germany before 1837, and how unsuccessful previous efforts in this direction had been, certain sovereigns having favored piratical reprints, Professor Hewett examined the history of the text of a single poem, *Hermann und Dorothea*, giving a summary of the results of a collation of nearly all the printed editions of the poem, about forty-five in number, including many hitherto unknown reprints. It was shown that the contamination of the text began as early as 1798, the year after the publication of the poem, and that these errors were repeated in later unauthorized editions until the first collected edition of the works, 1808 (A), where, in spite of the revision of Goethe, the publisher used as the basis of the text a Reutlingen reprint of 1806, which contained numerous typographical errors, and that these errors were incorporated in all subsequent editions of the poem, and appeared in the collected editions of Goethe's works; namely, in B and B', and in C and C', and thus became a part of the standard text. Only one revision of the poem by the author can be predicated. All other changes are due to the caprices or inaccuracies of proof-readers and compositors. More than twenty readings derived from pirated editions, which have been received into the text, were pointed out. Among the indirect results of the investigation, it was shown that the classification of the dates of publication of the various volumes of the first edition of the *Werke* (A) by the Weimar editors required revision (*Goethe Jahrbuch*, vol. xvi, p. 262); no essential divergence was found in the text of the poem in editions B and B'; and the readings of Egmont given by Strehlke in the Hempel edition of Goethe were verified (see Minor. Goethe's *Werke*, Weimar ed. vol. 8, p. 342).

In the last paper of the session upon the

"Parallel treatment of the vowel *e* in Old French and Provençal," Dr. A. Jodocius, of Philadelphia, gave a summary of the vowel *e* in open and closed syllables both in Old French and Provençal, as well as in their principal dialects, with the differences of pronunciation in the various parts of France. He also cited rimes from the *Donat Proensal*, and the opinions of the principal authorities on the origin of the suffixes, as evidence that the supposed existence of a suffix *erium*, replacing *arium* at an epoch anterior to the formation of any Romanic language, could not explain such forms as *porchier*, *cavallaria*, and others.

In the evening, the Association met in extra session to listen to the address of the President. The Provost of the University, Mr. Charles C. Harrison presided and made an address of welcome to the Association. Professor Cook's subject was "The province of English Philology." His theme was not English philology proper, but the use of the terms "philology" and "philologist" in English. Maintaining the view of Wolf and Boeckh to be the correct one,—that any permanent record of man's intellectual activity is proper to philology, and that any form of study of the spoken, or of the written word, is essentially philologic, the aim of which is in a scientific spirit and with scientific method to reconstruct the past. He made a plea against that current limitation of the term philologist which would make it apply to the linguist only as distinguished from the student of literature, pointing out the antagonism, or apparent antagonism, which necessarily results between the two bodies of workers, despite the fact of their essential unity of aim.

"We must never forget," Professor Cook said in part, "that the philologist is a lover. As Pythagoras was not willing to be called a wise man, but only a lover of wisdom, and thus coined the word philosophy, so the philologist may well be content to call himself a lover, too—a lover of the thrilling and compelling voices of the past. He becomes a philologist, if he is worthy of the name, because they have thrilled and compelled him; and he would fain devise means, however circuitous in appearance, by which to insure that they shall thrill and compel others. His sensibility is the measure of his devotion; and his devotion, while it may not be the measure of his success, is certainly its indispensable condition.

If, then, philology truly considered enlists the head in the service of the heart, if it de-

mands not only high and manifold discipline but rich natural endowment; if its object is the revelation to the present of the spiritual attainments of the past; if it seeks to win free access for the thoughts of the mightiest thinkers and the dreams of the most visionary of poets; if it seeks to train the imagination to recreate the form and pressure of a vanished time, in order to stimulate our own age to equal or surpass its predecessors in whatever best illustrates and ennobles humanity; if there are not wanting numerous examples of poets who have been philologists and philologists who have been essentially poets; and, finally, if philology is the only term which thus fully comprehends these various aspects of a common subject (and we have the most authoritative precedents for employing it in that signification), shall we willingly allow the word to be depreciated and this largeness and unity of the corresponding conception imperiled by consenting to employ it for the designation of a single branch of the comprehensive whole, and that the branch which to the popular apprehension least exhibits the real import and aim of the science? If not, and if we are willing to be known as philologists in the truer and larger sense, can we not do something to make this sense the prevalent one by consistently adhering to it in our practice, and so far as possible, inducing others to accept and adopt it?

"By thus doing we shall not only be recognizing a truth which is indisputable, but also be promoting that harmony of opinions and sentiments without which the most strenuous individual efforts are certain to prove in some degree nugatory."

The second session, Tuesday morning, Dec. 28th, opened with a paper by Dr. Edwin S. Lewis of Princeton University, upon "The morphology of the Guernsey dialect." This paper was the continuation of a study which has appeared in the *Publications* of the Association, dealing with the phonology of the Guernsey dialect. The completed work on the morphology will be published at a later date, only a few of the leading points being mentioned at the Convention. 1. Guernsey words ending in *-e*, from Latin *-ellum*, have *-jo* in the plural. This development differs from that in Normandy proper, where are found such products resulting as sing. *-jo* plur. *-jo*, or sing. *-e* plur. *-jā*, or sing. *-jo* plur. *-jā*. In Guernsey there are only two products corresponding to these: *bjō* plur. *bjō* and *vjo* plur. *vjo*. Attention was also called to lengthening in the plural, with its varying developments: *bæ* or *bæf* plur. *bā*, *sək* plur. *sē*; *ljē* plur. *li*; *žnūāi* plur. *žnūā*; *miræ* plur. *mirær*;

jēl plur. *jēr*, and these forms were explained. 2. Masculine nouns ending in *-æ* have *-rēs* in the feminine, as *sōzæ* fem. *sōzrēs*, *filæ* fem. *glærēs*, the latter word illustrating, in the masculine, the palatalization of intervocalic *l* immediately preceding the accent. 3. *ü* develops after the sibilant *š* in *šū*, *šūt*, *šūna*, and also in *žū*, used after the verb. 4. The Guernsey dialect would seem to lend weight to Behrens's argument that in such forms as *avez-vous*, *savez-vous*, the accent was first pushed back to the stem of the verb, thus causing the fall of the ending *-vez*. Gaston Paris's idea was that the accent was first pushed forward to the pronoun.

Various peculiarities of the Guernsey personal pronouns were also mentioned, and argument for the development of *nou* from *l'on* was found in the Guernsey expressions *nou fait*, from Latin *NON FACIT*, and *boudiax*, corresponding to the French *bon Dieu*.

The paper which followed was by Dr. Eva March Tappan of the Worcester English High School, upon "The poetry of Nicolas Breton." It opened with a survey of the great events of the age in which Breton lived and noted their failure to produce any visible effect upon his poetical works. Breton is to be classified as a religious poet who made literary departures into *vers de société*, satire, and pastoral. His *vers de société* received little praise, and its one gem, *A Sweet Lullaby*, was ruthlessly claimed for Gascoigne.

As a satirist, Breton is to be regarded as a literary descendant of Gascoigne, his satire having little in common with that of Hall, Donne, or Marston. His religious verse shows, it was stated, two of the marks of the real hymn. 1. It embodies a real, or seemingly real, individual experience. 2. It manifests no consciousness of the audience. His freedom in religious composition was ascribed to his conventional and uncontroversial disposition, and to the fact that his creed consisted of but three articles, namely: 1. wrong is punished, 2. right is rewarded, 3. repentance wins forgiveness. Breton knew nothing of the theological pessimism of Gascoigne, nothing of the ecstasies of Southwell, nothing of the higher selfishness of Thomas à Kempis, but he was a simple, true-hearted, Christian man, who meant to do his best, and was sorry when he failed. His religious verse, always

tender, sweet and hopeful, developed into rare earnestness, clearness of vision, and an exquisite eagerness of childlike longing and trust. The verbal style of these religious writings shows the delight in words common to all Elizabethans, a proof of their appreciation of a form of life so intangible that we, unhappily, have lost much of their delicate sensitiveness to its existence.

The pastoral of the sixteenth century was in perfect accord with three of the leading tendencies of the age, 1. The inherent English love of nature and simplicity. 2. The healthy liking for the marvellous, fastened by the great events of the age. 3. The keen interest in human nature that was to find its highest development in the drama. Breton's pastoral was regarded as proceeding from love of nature combined with close study of human nature. The interest taken by Elizabeth in his first pastoral, *Phillido and Corydon*, was explained by its possible connection with the Earl of Leicester's entertainment given to the Queen in 1578. The pastoral and erotic verse of Breton was compared with that of Sannazaro, Googe, Surrey, Wyatt, Turberville, Spenser, Lyly, Sidney, and Gascoigne. His association with Gascoigne was treated as being probably more intimate than is generally supposed.

Breton's independence of character and his intellectual modesty were next discussed. His popularity with the same audience that admired far greater poets was ascribed, aside from his literary merits, 1. to his following the literary lines of least resistance, 2. to his power to please an unusually varied audience, resulting from his ability to combine in each kind of verse qualities that most writers would have found inharmonious.

The paper closed with a *résumé* of the literary criticism which Breton has received during the past three hundred years.

Professor A. R. Marsh of Harvard University, who was to have read a paper upon "The discussion of Conduct in the Middle Ages," was, it is to be regretted, kept at home by illness. Dr. Tappan was, therefore, followed by Professor Richard Hochdörfer of Wittenberg College, who read a paper upon "Luther's 'Teufel' and Goethe's 'Mephistopheles.'"

Professor Hochdörfer based his investigations upon the Erlangen-Frankfurt edition of

Luther's works in sixty-eight volumes, and upon Goethe's *Faust*, referring especially to the editions of G. von Loeper, K. J. Schröer, and Calvin Thomas. Comparing the definitions that Luther has given of his 'Teufel' with those that Goethe puts into the mouth of his Mephistopheles, the writer pointed out their common characteristics. Both Luther's 'Teufel' and Goethe's 'Mephistopheles,' were shown to be conceived as authors of sin and death, being prompted by hatred and envy which is chiefly directed against God's creatures; both are pictured as man's accuser and reviler before God. After tracing these common characteristics in their literary prototypes, the writer reached the following conclusions: 1. that the first figure in literature which exhibits the constitutional elements of this two-fold Luther-Goethean conception is the devil of the apocryphal book of Wisdom; 2. that Luther's 'Teufel' is this devil as developed first by the Bible narratives of Christ's temptation and of Job's trial, secondly by theology, folklore and literature; 3. that all the biblical, mythological, theological, and legendary ingredients of Goethe's Mephistopheles are found in Luther's many-sided creation.

In the paper which followed, "Notes on some Elizabethan poems," by Professor John B. Henneman, of the University of Tennessee, two of the best-known Elizabethan poems were analyzed, Barnefield's ode, "As it fell upon a day," and Marlowe's smooth song, "Come live with me and be my love." Both of these poems, as usually given, Professor Henneman believed to be composite, and to indicate the process of development and growth that many poems of the Elizabethan era have gone through. The first part of the Barnefield ode has the true note of the lyrics, expressing the pathos of a ruined woman's heart. The second part is completely changed in spirit. It is didactic and singularly unpoetic in contrast with the preceding. Evidently a bi-section of the poem is warranted. There is just a possibility that the claims of both Shakespeare and Barnefield can be satisfied by giving the truer lyric to Shakespeare, and the addition with the didactic application found in Barnefield to Barnefield. At any rate, whoever the author or authors, the composite character of the poem is very evident. If further Barnefield's ode can be considered as a pendant and contrast to

"On a day, alack the day!
Love whose month is ever May,"

inasmuch as this latter (contained in *Love's Labour's Lost*) was written as early as 1590 or thereabouts, the former cannot be much later, and thus a date distinctly earlier than 1598 (when it appears in Barnefield with the addition) must be set for it. This view would increase the probability of the Shakespearian authorship of the truer original poem.

Similarly, Marlowe's poem appears in three forms, one with four stanzas in the *Passionate Pilgrim*; another with six stanzas, in *England's Helicon*; a third in seven stanzas, in Walton's *Compleat Angler*. The form with seven stanzas clearly results from a later addition. It is thought, too, that the form with four stanzas shows the true first form of a poem popular enough to be frequently copied and imitated, and thus added to.

Professor Henneman's paper was followed by a paper on "The relation of Drama to Literature" by Professor Brander Matthews of Columbia University. Professor Matthews protested against the tendency to judge plays too exclusively from the literary standpoint. There is a general tendency, he said, to judge other arts by the principles that govern literature, owing to the influence given to the art of writing by the invention of printing and the extension of writing. The printers have finally succeeded in their protest against a judgment of their work in accordance with the principles of another art. The orator and dramatist may well contend that an orator or a drama shall not be judged as literature only, but in accordance with the principles of its own art. Both are bound by the same inexorable condition; each must please an immediate audience. Their adaptation to that end must be considered first. Upon that, their prime virtue, their merit depends: their literary value, while it is obviously the condition upon which their immortality depends, is secondary. This adaptation to an immediate audience is an art in itself, and one not *per se* within the province of the literary critic, or at least one which he is bound to consider before rendering judgment. The fact that this art is necessary is an explanation of the shortcomings of the closet-drama.

"There is no more patent absurdity than the play that is not intended to be played. . . . A rough and tumble farce, hastily knocked

together by a variety-show performer, to satirize rudely some folly of the moment, is of more importance in the development of the drama than can be any string of soliloquies and dialogues, however poetic or polished these may be. . . . Nobody disputes that dramatic literature must be literature, although there are not a few who do not insist that it must be dramatic. The great dramatists have accepted the double obligation; and they have always recognized that the stage of the theatre, and not the desk of the library, is the true proving room. This double obligation it is that makes the drama so difficult an art,—perhaps, indeed, the most difficult of all the arts."

The last paper of the morning by Dr. T. S. Baker of Johns Hopkins University upon "The influence of Lawrence Sterne on German Literature" was read by title.

At the opening of the afternoon session, the Committee of Twelve, appointed a year ago to consider the question of entrance examinations in French and German, presented its report through its chairman, Professor Calvin Thomas of Columbia University. The committee had agreed upon a resolution to the effect that there is no reason for differentiating the amount of modern languages taught in the preparatory schools to students who enter college and to those who do not enter college. The chairman further announced the appointment of several working sub-committees, and recommended the appropriation of three hundred dollars of the Association's funds for the purpose of prosecuting the work in hand, which was approved by the Convention.

On the recommendation of the committee on the selection of a place of meeting for next year, the invitation of the University of Virginia was accepted.

The Secretary of the Association then read a memorial sent to the Convention by Senator Cullom of Illinois asking that it pass a resolution expressing its approval of the anti-ticket-scalping bill, now before Congress. A motion to lay the memorial upon the table was lost, and upon motion of Professor Cohn, the Secretary was instructed to return the memorial to Senator Cullom, with the statement that it was not within the province of the Association to deal with political matters.

The following officers were then elected for the ensuing year: President, Professor Alcée Fortier, Tulane University; Secretary, Profes-

sor James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University; Treasurer, Professor Herbert E. Greene, Johns Hopkins University.

Executive Council—Professor C. T. Winchester, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Professor Albert S. Cook, Yale University; Professor R. Hochdörfer, Wittenberg College; Professor A. R. Hohlfeld, Vanderbilt University; Professor Bliss Perry, Princeton University; Professor Gustav Karsten, University of Indiana; Professor Charles M. Gayley, University of California; Professor J. A. Harrison, University of Virginia; Professor W. S. Currell, Washington and Lee University.

Phonetic Section—President, Professor A. Melville Bell, Washington, D. C.; Secretary, Professor George Hempl, University of Michigan.

Pedagogical Section—President, Professor F. N. Scott, University of Michigan; Secretary, Professor W. E. Mead, Wesleyan University.

Editorial Committee—Professor C. H. Grandgent, Harvard University; Prof. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg, University of Chicago.

Illness having prevented the attendance of Dr. P. B. Marcou of Harvard University, whose subject was to have been "Are French poets poetical?," the first paper of the afternoon was read by Professor W. E. Mead of Wesleyan University, upon "Color in Old English poetry."

The paper aimed to show in the first place what slight attention had been given in general to the use of color in poetry, and, in particular, pointed out that no systematic investigation of color in Old English poetry had ever been made. The following topics were then discussed: the great number of possible colors, and the lack of names for them; the indefiniteness of O. E. color words; the small number of O. E. color words; results of comparison with the mediæval romancers, Chaucer and Shakespeare.

The comparative lack of color in O. E. poetry does not necessarily imply a poor quality of poetry. In contrast with the small number of color words, the great number of terms in O. E. poetry may be noted expressing light and darkness. Over three hundred words may be found expressing light or brightness; over two hundred expressing darkness or shadow, or blackness. The ground being thus cleared, groups were made of the genuine color words,

—white, black, gray, brown, red, yellow, green, and numerous passages cited under each. Blue occurs but once. Red is not common, and with five exceptions, occurs only in the religious poems. It is not once found in *Beowulf* or in any of the other heroic poems, or in the lyrics. Green is, on the whole, the favorite color in O. E. poetry, yet, like red, it is not used. A comparison with Old High German and Old Saxon poetry followed, which showed that O. E. poetry held its own in comparison. A further comparison was then made with Old Celtic poetry as found in the *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, and with the Icelandic poems in vol. i of the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*. Several notable facts came out in this comparison—the greater richness and definiteness of the colors in the Celtic and Icelandic poems being most remarkable. The most common Icelandic color is red, and one of the least notable is green. In conclusion, the remark was made that the color-sense in the O. E. poets was comparatively feeble, and that conventionality played a large part in the passages where color was used at all.

The paper which followed was by Professor Adolphe Cohn, of Columbia College, on "Professor Schultz-Gora and the *Testament de Rousseau*."

The object of this paper was the discussion of the claim to authenticity of a short work attributed to Jean Jacques Rousseau, and recently published by Professor Schultz-Gora, privat-docent in the University of Berlin. The title of the work, which is only twenty pages long, is *Testament de Jean Jacques Rousseau*. It is a reprint of a small pamphlet dated 1771, of which only one copy seems to be in existence, in the public library of Berlin. Schultz-Gora believes it to be authentic, his arguments being mainly, that the style is unmistakably Rousseau's own; that the ideas, which are in some parts very ably and clearly set forth, are also Rousseau's, and that the spelling is the same as that of Rousseau's own letters. In regard to the similarity of the style with that of Rousseau's, this is an argument which may be easily misleading, as it is entirely a question of personal appreciation upon which one may well differ from Schultz-Gora's judgment. We find, for instance, expressions in the testament, such as, "rompre ma plume," "le peuple comique," meaning the come-

dians, which we think Rousseau never used in his own works; but there are other arguments against the authenticity of the testament. First, we have here a book purporting to be published in 1771, and to give an account, or a defence, of all Rousseau's works, and yet it does not mention the *Confessions*, from which Rousseau began to give readings in Paris in the summer of 1770. Then in Rousseau's *Dialogues*, which were written a few years later, and in which the philosopher, then in a suspicious mood which almost amounted to insanity, defends all his life, acts and utterances, no mention whatever is made of the testament, or of the purloining of the manuscript of the same. Another argument is found in the Latin motto which is printed on the title page of the Testament "Qui notus nimis omnibus, ignotus moritur sibi." Schultz-Gora finds it very difficult to explain this motto, and the explanation he gives of it is very far from clear. The references to the passages in the testament induces us to believe that the author of the Testament himself did not understand it. That he was a very poor Latinist is shown by the fact that he fails to understand the meaning of Rousseau's works, "Vitam impendere vero," which he considers as meaning that Rousseau was ready to undergo martyrdom for the sake of the truth, while its meaning is simply that Rousseau wished to devote his life to the spreading of the truth. As Rousseau, though not a great, was a very accurate scholar, this alone would convince us that he is not the author of the Testament. There are, however, passages enough in the Testament which read very much like Rousseau's to account for Schultz-Gora's error, possibly they are reproductions of some of Rousseau's conversations. There are also some ironical passages directed against the inhabitants of the northern bank of the Lake of Geneva, which lead us to believe that the pamphlet is the work of some inhabitant of that district who was acquainted with Rousseau until the time of the latter's departure for England, and who found it convenient to hide his own identity under the shelter of the name of his great countryman.

In the third paper of the morning, "Recent Work in Celtic," Dr. F. N. Robinson, of Harvard University, gave a survey of the work done in Celtic philology in the past ten or

twelve years, taking as a point of departure a similar report prepared by Dr. Thurneysen in 1886 and incorporated in the address of Professor Skeat as President of the English Philological Society. (See *Transactions of the Phil. Soc'y.* 1885-6. pp. 385 ff.) He began with the Continental Celtic, and gave some account of recent investigations by both philologists and archæologists in the Gaulish languages, antiquities, and religion, taking up then in order the insular Celtic races, and showing what advance had been made during the past decade in the publication of texts, in grammatical and lexicographical work, and in the study of mythology, folklore, and literary history. Special attention was called to some methods of investigation which promise to yield important results: to Strachan's *Studies in Irish Historical Grammar*; to Zimmer's discussions of the cycles of St. Brandan and of Finn; and to the comparisons between Welsh and Irish literature, made by Rhys in his *Hibbert Lectures*, and by both Rhys and Meyer in a number of articles in the *Transactions of the Cymrudorion*, the *Revue Celtique*, and *Archæologia Cambrensis*.

Dr. Robinson was followed by Professor William H. Hulme of Adelbert College, who spoke on "The relation of the Old English version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* to the Latin original." The chief topics considered were as follows. 1. A brief history of the *Acta Pilati* in early Christian literature with special reference to (a.) their origin, (b.) significance and importance. 2. A short review of recent criticism of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*: (a.) Relation of Greek and Latin versions, (b.) Origin of title 'Gospel of Nicodemus,' (c.) Earliest editions of Greek and Latin versions, (d.) Tischendorf's (1853) 'final' edition, his theories relative to origin of Greek and Latin texts, and Lipsius's refutation of same in his *Die Pilatus-Akten kritisch untersucht* (Kiel 1871; second ed. 1886). 3. The Nicodemus legend in the early Latin literature of England, and its first appearance in Old English poetry. 4. The description and history of the existing Mss. of the Old English prose version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, and a word for word comparison of this version with the Latin original. 5. The use of *p* and *ð* in the Cambridge Ms. of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*: *p* consistently used initially; *ð* occurring throughout the Ms. medially

and finally, except in words preceded by monosyllables beginning with *p* and ending in a vowel, or preceded by *p* (*pæt*), *ð* in such cases being regularly used in the initial position.

The last two papers of the session, "The French literature of Louisiana from 1894 to 1897," by Professor Alcée Fortier, Tulane University, and "The rhythm of proper names in Old English verse," by Professor James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University, were read by title.

During the afternoon, the American Dialect Society held its annual meeting. At this meeting Professor O. F. Emerson of Western Reserve University was elected president; Professor John P. Fruit of Georgetown, Ky., formerly of Bethel College, vice-president; Professor E. H. Babbitt of Columbia University, secretary; and Professor Lewis F. Mott of the College of the City of New York, treasurer.

In the evening the members of the Association enjoyed a delightful reception tendered them by Provost and Mrs. C. C. Harrison.

The first paper of the session the following morning was by Dr. Frederick H. Wilkens of Baltimore, Md., upon the "Early influence of German literature in America."

The second paper was by Professor Edward Fulton, of Wells College, "On translating Anglo-Saxon poetry." The question has often arisen, What verse should be used in translating Anglo-Saxon poetry? but despite frequent discussion has not been definitely settled. The tendency seems to be decidedly in favor of imitating the original metre; but some still argue in favor of blank verse, on the ground that it is our natural "epic expression," and therefore the only fit medium in which to render such a poem as *Beowulf*, for instance. This argument, however, rests on the assumption that one so-called "epic expression" is essentially the same thing as another—which is, of course, absurd. Blank verse is not adapted to the style of A. S. poetry.

The *manner* of poetry—that is to say, the peculiar phrases, turns of expression, rhythmical movement, etc.—is just as essential an element of it as its matter, and in any translation that attempts to give an adequate idea of the original must be reproduced, if possible, as well as the *matter*. To give anything like

a true representation of the *Béowulf*, for instance, we must seek to reproduce its imagery and its rhythmical movement, as well as its ideas, just as in copying the Venus of Milo we must try to reproduce the pose of the head and the expression of the face. To the objection often urged that the A. S. meter is radically different from English verse, and therefore impossible of reproduction, the answer is, the fact is otherwise, for seventy five out of one hundred lines have rhythmical movements for which exact parallels may be found in modern English four-accent verse. As Schipper, in his *Grundriss der englischen Metrik*, has shown, the English irregular four-accent measure has strong affinities with the A. S. verse. Moreover, it is capable of modification so as to resemble the A. S. line still more strongly. Taking all this into account, it would seem that this measure—or rather a modification of it sufficiently like the A. S. to suggest it at once and inevitably, yet not so unlike the English line as to sound strange to the modern ear—was the proper one to use in translating A. S. poetry into English verse. An adaptation like this has been tried at various times, and notably by Dr. John Leslie Hall in his translation of *Béowulf*, but his translation, though the best of its kind, still leaves much to be desired.

Miss Elizabeth Woodbridge of Yale University, then read a paper upon "Boccaccio's Defense of Poetry; as contained in the fourteenth book of the *De Genealogia Deorum*." The fourteenth chapter of the *De Genealogia Deorum*, Miss Woodbridge said, is significant as being the earliest elaboration of the art-theory of the New Humanism. In it Boccaccio replies to the enemies of poetry; namely, the jurists, the doctors, and the theologians,—quoting and answering all their objections one by one. Thus the treatise furnishes a fair exposition of the way poetry was regarded by its enemies and by its friends.

Boccaccio's definition of poetry, which is in essential agreement with that of Dante and Petrarch, emphasizes, as regards its form, the careful ordering and disposition of words; as regards its content, the existence of a hidden meaning, an allegorical significance. The accusations against poetry, as summarized by him, are chiefly these: that it is a mere nullity, not worth serious attention; that it is a collec-

tion of lies; that it is either mere foolishness or it is morally baneful; that it is too obscure to be intelligible; that at best the poets are only "apes of the philosophers;" that we cannot disregard the authority of Jerome and Boethius, who condemned poetry, and of Plato, who would have had poets banished from his republic.

In reply, Boccaccio maintains that poetry is deeply serious by reason of the spiritual meanings hidden beneath its "veil of fable;" that it does not lie, since it does not try to pass for truth; that while some poetry is indeed morally hurtful, all truly great poetry elevates the mind and incites it to virtue; that the obscurity of poetry is commendable, since this enhances the value of the hidden truths, while it always yields them up to the earnest seeker; that the poets are not "apes of the philosophers," although their writings are consonant with those of philosophy,—rather, they are themselves philosophers; finally, that Jerome and Boethius and Plato have been misunderstood, for they meant to condemn only the bad poets, not such divine spirits as Homer, Virgil, Dante, or Petrarch.

One of Boccaccio's most telling arguments, and the one most frequently and most eagerly pressed, is the argument from Biblical writing. A large part of the Old and the New Testament falls under his definition of poetry; if, therefore, we condemn the "fables" of poets, we must also condemn the visions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and John, and the parables of Christ himself.

In his attitude towards poetry Boccaccio was in no sense a pioneer; most of his ideas are found, expressed or implied, in the writings of Dante and Petrarch. But neither Dante nor Petrarch gave to their views so complete and so elaborate an expression. Moreover, Boccaccio emphasized rather more strongly and more deliberately than they had done, two points which especially characterized the thought of the times: the acceptance of poetry as a legitimate part of life, and the acknowledgment of it as independent of philosophy on the one hand, and religion on the other. Thus Boccaccio's treatise makes one in the series which begins with Plato and Aristotle, and comes down to Sidney and Shelley.

The fourth paper of the morning was by Dr. Kenneth McKenzie of Union College, on "A

sonnet ascribed to Chiaro Davanzati and its place in fable literature." Davanzati, a Florentine poet of the thirteenth century, was shown to be the probable author of the sonnet in question (Cod. Vat. 3793, no. 682). The words *corniglia* and *splai*, properly not Italian, are due to Provençal influence. The sonnet, a version of the familiar fable of the bird in borrowed feathers, was sent as an accusation of plagiarism to the poet Bonagiunta da Lucca; this fact accords with what Dante says of him. In fable literature this sonnet is important, because it does not follow the versions which were so common in the Middle Ages, descending from Phædrus, but belongs to a type older than Phædrus, and indicates the existence of a mass of fable literature in popular tradition; it is also important as being almost the only version of a fable given by an Italian poet of the time.

The paper which followed was by Dr. C. G. Child of the University of Pennsylvania, upon "Seventeenth Century Conceits." The Seventeenth Century Conceit proper was defined as a kind of perverted metaphor, displaying in particular perverse ingenuity of invention—over-elaboration, extravagance or even grotesque unfitness, counting for nothing beside novelty and a certain specious picturesqueness. The aim of the paper was to show upon the basis of an examination of one hundred and eight works printed before 1500, beginning with Tottel's *Miscellany*, and of all the notable authors after that date to Dryden and Milton, that (1.) under the influence of Petrarch and the Marinists, in the sonnet cycles beginning with Sidney's (and incidentally in the *Arcadia*), in some measure owing to the use of extravagant hyperbole, the inventional conceit was developed, its use becoming independent of the sonnet about 1596–1598, and that (2.) in the seventeenth century, active disposition to the origination of novel inventional conceits was almost entirely confined to the poets of Cambridge, other poets, where they use conceit, employing conventionalized conceits derived from the sonneteers.

The subject of the next paper by Professor F. N. Scott of the University of Michigan, was "Verbal taboos, their nature and origin." In certain books that have appeared within the last quarter of a century, Professor Scott said, attempts have been made to place a ban or

prohibition upon the use of certain well-known and much-used English words and phrases. These prohibitions, which may be termed verbal taboos, from their resemblance to the taboos of aboriginal tribes, are the outcome of antipathies which are formed in early years while the individual is acquiring command of speech. Such antipathies are common to all persons, being due to the associations which naturally occur in the formation of the speech-habit; but in the case of most persons they are checked or repressed by a sense of deference to the feelings of others in the community. There are some few persons, however, in each generation, who are unusually self-assertive in matters of language. Such persons look upon their personal antipathies as universal, and do not hesitate to impose them upon their neighbors. It is from these persons that verbal taboos proceed. The character and origin of these antipathies was illustrated by a number of examples, in part derived from a special examination in regard to the meanings of selected words.

The final paper, by Dr. C. R. Miller of Lehigh University upon "Prepositions in the works of Hans Sachs," was read by title.

During the day the Joint Committee on Entrance Requirements in English held a meeting to receive reports from two sub-committees, one on interpretation of the requirements, and the other on a list of books for general reading in the secondary schools.

Before adjourning to meet next December, at the University of Virginia, a resolution was adopted by the Association expressing its thanks to Provost Harrison and to the Local Committee.¹

CLARENCE G. CHILD.

University of Pennsylvania.

THE THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE CENTRAL DIVISION OF
THE MODERN LANGUAGE
ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICA.

THE third annual meeting of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America was held at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., on Thursday, Friday

¹ The writer desires to express his indebtedness to those who have furnished him with abstracts of their papers.

and Saturday, December 30 and 31, 1897, and January 1, 1898. The convention was called to order Thursday evening in the Assembly Hall of the Orrington Lunt Library Building. The guests were welcomed on behalf of the Trustees and Faculty of Northwestern University by Professor G. A. Coe, representing President Henry Wade Rogers, who was unexpectedly detained in New York. The Hon. William A. Dyche, Mayor of Evanston, spoke words of welcome on behalf of the citizens. Professor W. H. Carruth (University of Kansas), President of the Central Division, made an appropriate response to these cordial greetings. At the request of President Carruth himself, the President's annual address was omitted. Secretary H. Schmidt-Wartenberg (University of Chicago) read communications from the Evanston Club and the Country Club extending their privileges to the members of the association, and made other announcements. After listening to a paper by Professor J. Scott Clark (Northwestern University), of which mention will be made later, the meeting adjourned to the Guild rooms in the same building, where an informal reception was given by the University Guild. On New Year's Eve another reception was tendered by the Northwestern University at the home of the Country Club. Throughout the three days of the convention the members had an opportunity to inspect the German library that had recently arrived from Leipzig as a gift to the Northwestern University from Chicago Germans.

There were five regular sessions. President Carruth presided, but on two or three occasions called to the chair the second Vice-President, Professor C. W. Benton (University of Minnesota). Under the head of reports Professor George Hempl (University of Michigan) made an interesting report for the committee on phonetics, and urged the importance of dialect study, and Professor Starr W. Cutting (University of Chicago) reported progress for the committee on college entrance requirements. There were seventeen papers on the programme, distributed as follows: English six, German four, Romance Languages three, Scandinavian Languages three, and General Philology one.

The first paper of the convention was presented by Professor J. Scott Clark (Northwestern University) on "Methods of Studying

English Masterpieces." In justice to Professor Clark it should be said that he spoke not as a teacher of literature, but from the standpoint of a teacher of the practical art of English composition. He discussed at some length the two methods that have been most widely followed, the hand-book method and the annotated edition method, and pointed out the faults in each. The basis for the principal criticism on the first method was the fact that the hand-book tells what some one has said about the masterpiece, while the student has no opportunity to study the masterpiece itself. In the case of the second method the work of annotating has been overdone; every sentence has been placed under a microscope, and allusions, references, and rhetorical figures have been interpreted to cover ground never dreamed of by the original author. Professor Clark then described a method that, in his own experience, had been found more fruitful, and therefore more satisfactory. He called it a laboratory method. He approached the exposition inductively by inquiring first, what results a student ought fairly to expect and to obtain. These results will be sufficiently indicated by the nature of the instructions to the student that follow. The method aims at a study of the masterpieces themselves, and is aided by binding together in one volume long selections from the representative writers, say forty pages from each author, making enough of these composite volumes to put one into the hands of each member of the class. To defray the original cost, each student is charged a small amount for the use of the books which remain the property of the department. Suppose now, for example, that the class is to study Bacon. To each student are assigned the forty pages of Bacon that happen to be contained in the volume in his hands, and he is required to make a report in his note-book on the subjects indicated by the following instructions: 1. Jot down every word you meet not in ordinary, conversational use and from the total select ten; 2. observe every word used with especial accuracy or delicacy, and record best five cases; 3. record approximate percentage of Anglo-Saxon words; 4. observe every clear case of English idiom and record five cases; 5. observe and mentally define every rhetorical figure found and index best five cases; 6. observe every case of suspense or of loose construction and index

pages; 7. observe and index best five cases of epigram, balance or point; 8. index best cases of smoothness in the connection of paragraphs; 9. index best illustrations of simplicity; and 10. index best examples of rhythm.

Professor Clarke's method was discussed by Professors A. H. Tolman, J. D. Bruner, and S. W. Cutting (University of Chicago), Professor J. S. Nollen (Iowa College) and the author. The consensus of opinion seemed to be that the merits of the method consist in the fact that it gives the student something definite to do.

Professor Ernst Voss (University of Wisconsin) read the next paper, "Thomas Murner's Prose Writings of the year 1520." By way of introduction he spoke of Grimm's "antagonistic" attitude towards Modern High German and his fondness for old forms, and gave a résumé of the work in early Modern High German since Grimm. It is natural, he said, that Luther should get the lion's share in any work on the sixteenth century, but Brant, Hutten, and Murner ought to be studied with just as much zeal and interest from the standpoint of language and literature. Then followed a review of the work about Murner, including 1. Text editions; 2. Murner's relation to Brant, Geiler and Luther; 3. Murner Grammar; and 4. Biographies. Professor Voss spoke of the character of Murner's satirical writings and stated that all are now available, while his prose writings, with one or two exceptions, have never been printed since their first appearance. A list of Murner's prose writings of the year 1520 was then given, with comments on each one, and the importance of these works to the student of theology, history, literature and philology was shown. Murner's position can not be accurately defined without a consideration of his prose writings, especially those of 1520. Professor Voss urged that Murner's works ought to be re-edited, his biography re-written, and his place in German literature re-adjusted, and closed his paper with the announcement that he is about to reprint, in Braune's *Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des xvi. und xvii. Jahrhunderts*, one of the most important prose writings of 1520. Professor Starr W. Cutting (University of Chicago) made remarks upon this paper, and stated that we have misunderstood Murner because we have studied him through the prejudiced writings of his contemporaries.

"The Autobiographical Elements in William Langland's *Piers the Plowman*" was the subject of a paper read by Professor A. E. Jack (Lake Forest University). The name of the author of this poem is a matter of some doubt and few facts are known concerning his life. The opinions of Skeat and Morley were reviewed. Skeat believes the author gives his own life in the poem; Morley maintains the same view and accepts the name William Langley. The writer of the paper attempted to show that the usual method of interpreting the poem literally is wrong and that the poem is not a real autobiographical picture, but an ideal picture. He pointed out among others these facts; namely, that in a large number of cases a definite time is stated when evidently merely a long time is meant; that also in the case of distance and numbers definite measures are given for indefinite; that the poet mentions no real personages excepting two friars; that dreams and visions compose nearly the whole poem (there are eleven visions), and that it seems very patent that the poet is relating not real but imaginary dreams. The conclusion is that the dreams are certainly a literary device and that, on the whole, the poem contains very little autobiographical material. Professor F. A. Blackburn (University of Chicago) made a few remarks on the paper, and stated that he would go even farther and refuse to see anything at all autobiographical in the poem. Professor C. W. Pearson (Northwestern University) thought the poem contained the inner life of the poet, but not the outer life.

Professor F. A. Wood (Cornell College) read extracts from one of the most scholarly papers of the convention; it was entitled "The Development of Roots and their Meanings." The paper was a long one as it traced the history of seven roots, but Professor Wood spent the half hour allotted to him in presenting one root. Difference in meaning is no bar to connecting words, was the thesis the author attempted to prove. Phonetic equivalents, that is, words or roots which phonetically coincide when reduced to their Indo-European form, are presumably cognate, however widely separated in meaning. This difference is the result of divergent development. Two or more meanings, though apparently having nothing in common, and inexplicable if we attempt to derive one from the other, are often

easily explained when referred to the radiating center. For example, 'please' and 'distress' are diametrically opposed, yet both may come from the figurative use of *strike*. Hence of the meanings *a, b, c, d*, we should not assume that any one is the original, but should find from what common source *a, b, c, d* are derivable. In illustration many examples were given to show the logical connection in meaning between phonetically identical roots which, on account of their difference, are regarded as etymologically distinct.

"The Inflectional Types of the Qualifying Adjective in German" was the title of a paper read by Professor G. O. Curme (Northwestern University). The different types of adjective inflection were discussed in the light of past conditions and present tendencies. A brief history of the uninflected form, the weak, and the strong declensions was given. The so-called uninflected form was originally a strong form corresponding to the strong form of the substantive. The ending in the case of the nominative masculine and neuter singular had in both nouns and adjectives been lost in accordance with general phonetic laws. In the case of the adjective, pronominal forms in *-er* and *-es* later often took the place of the strong nominative masculine and neuter, which had lost their case endings. There were then, Professor Curme continued, two strong forms for the nominative singular. In the O. H. G. these two strong forms,—the so-called uninflected and the strong form,—had the same functions, both being used either attributively or predicatively. Later differentiation set in. A detailed statement of the present usage of these forms was given by the author, which was followed by a similar statement concerning the weak form. The earlier individualizing force of the weak adjective was noted, and all the remaining constructions which still show this individualizing force were mentioned. Attention was also called to the most recent development in the conception of the force of the weak adjective, namely, its use to show a closer logical relation to the governing substantive, as in *ein Mann von grossem juristischen Wissen*.

The paper was discussed by Professors S. W. Cutting, H. Schmidt-Wartenberg and Dr. P. O. Kern (University of Chicago), and the author. Professor Schmidt-Wartenberg stated

that what had been considered an inflectional ending in the case of predicate adjectives in certain Swiss dialects, was not an inflection but the remnant of a suffix and that *jemanden* for *jemandem* was due to regular phonetic development.

The subject of a contribution presented by Mr. E. P. Morton (Indiana University) was "One Phase of Keats's Treatment of Nature." The essentials of the study are: There is such a thing as ascription of sentiency to insentient objects without personification. This ascription of sentiency, called vivification by Mr. Morton, is a mode of expression, essentially a metaphor, and is used for vivid expression. In addition to proving that there is such a thing as vivification, he showed that Keats uses it so often in his poetry that any correct statement of this poet's attitude towards nature requires its recognition. In this attitude Keats is entirely different from his fellow Romantics. In one thousand lines of Keats it was found that there were three hundred and fifty-seven cases of vivification and one hundred and eighty-seven cases of personification, while Coleridge used vivification only two-thirds as often. Ruskin's Chapter on the Pathetic Fallacy seems at first sight to offer both a name and an explanation, but Mr. Morton showed that what Ruskin says applies only to subjective treatment of nature. This paper called out remarks from Professors A. H. Tolman and C. von Klenze and Mr. Karl D. Jessen (University of Chicago). Professor Tolman suggested in place of vivification 'personal metaphor,' a name used in Abbot's Shakespearean Grammar. Professor von Klenze said that he understood by vivification what is meant in German by *Beseelung*, and then made comments on Ruskin, Keats and Heine, which led him into a very interesting comparison of Heine's treatment of nature with that of the English poet.

The next paper on the programme was by Professor Raymond Weeks (University of Missouri) on "The Component Elements of Aliscans," but on account of the unavoidable absence of Professor Weeks it was read by title.

"The Gender of English Loan-Words in Danish" was the title of a paper by Professor D. K. Dodge (University of Illinois), which, owing to the absence of the author, was read

by Professor L. A. Rhoades of the same institution. The present system of gender in Danish is a compromise between strict grammatical gender and natural gender. About the time of the Reformation the distinction between the masculine and the feminine passed out of sight and the common gender was developed, which is a kind of neuter gender. Some English words were introduced into Danish in the eighteenth century, but nearly all have been introduced during the last twenty-five years. Many of these words are connected with sports, while many others have been adopted through contact with English-speaking people. The paper treated of the susceptibility of the Scandinavians to corruption of vocabulary. Professor Dodge collected the materials for his study from dictionaries, Copenhagen newspapers and Cavling's *Fra Amerika*, and has found about two hundred English loan-words, but the list is not exhaustive. Of the neuters twenty-one are names of materials; the majority of the others have Danish synonyms of neuter gender. Only *settlement* and *stock-jobbery* appear to have a gender determined by the ending; several others have the ending *-ing*, a regular common ending. In words of common gender there are several classes, as names of vehicles, articles of food, of dress, etc. Some few seem to be determined by ending, as *boycotting*, *elevator*, etc. *Baby* is of the common gender. The main results of Professor Dodge's investigations may be stated under five heads: 1. Only sixteen per cent of the English words in Danish are neuter, a disproportion similar to that of native words. 2. Many words may be divided into classes according to meaning. 3. The majority of the other English words are influenced by Danish synonyms. 4. Terminations seem to play a subordinate part. 5. No tendency to uncertainty or change of gender was noticed, such as exists in native words. The conclusions of Professor Dodge's study were accepted without discussion.

Professor A. E. Egge (Washington Agricultural College) had prepared an excellent paper on "The Scandinavian Element in English," but as he was unable to be present it was read by Professor A. H. Tolman (University of Chicago). It began by giving a brief sketch of the Scandinavian settlements in the British

Isles, more particularly in England, and then traced in outline the Scandinavian influence on the English language.

The first mention of northern pirates touching the coast of England, said the writer, is found in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for the year 787 (corrected to 789). At various times after this raids and incursions were made into the English territory, and in 866 came the great army of Vikings that seemed to have for their object the conquest of all England. They were finally able to control all the country to the north and east of a line running from London to Chester. The Danes for a long time ruled parts of this district independently and introduced their own laws and institutions. It was, therefore, called the Danelaw (Danelagh). Norse and English were spoken side by side, Norse predominating in some localities, and English in others. As far as the investigation of the Scandinavian element in English is concerned, it is of little importance to know from which of the Scandinavian countries the various bands of invaders came, as up to the year 1000 Danes, Norwegians and Swedes spoke one language, in Professor Egge's paper called Norse or Scandinavian. The effect of the Norman Conquest, and with it the introduction of Latin and later of French into the churches and courts of justice, was to deprive the Old English of its use as the literary medium of the nation, but the Norman speech, being a totally foreign tongue, did not have at once any organic or direct influence on English. There was no temptation to imitate French inflections, the writer stated. Old Norse and Old English were, indeed, two different languages; yet they were both purely Teutonic and closely related. The vocabulary was essentially the same, the main difference consisting in the inflections, and even this difference was in most cases comparatively slight. Englishmen and Norsemen of that day could doubtless understand each other without much difficulty. Professor Egge continued on the assumption that languages closely related will influence each other more than languages distantly or not related at all, and stated that this would explain why the influence of Danish and Low German on each other has deprived these languages of nearly all inflections of case, also why English of the

North, owing to the presence there of the closely related Norse, was deprived of its inflections before this change took place in the South. That this really happened is seen in the early disappearance of nearly all case-endings, so that already in the *Ormulum* (written about 1200) we meet with a specimen of English almost as uninflected as that of the present day. In the South, however, where one would suppose the Norman-French influence to have been the strongest, we find quite a different state of things. Many French words have indeed been adopted; but the grammatical structure shows no other signs of change than those of internal growth and decay, and the dialect remains rich in inflections to a late period. The *Ayenbite of Inwyrt*, for example, though composed in 1340, is much harder to understand than the *Ormulum*, written in the North almost two hundred years earlier. In the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* there appears, from the year 871, a large Scandinavian element. While there are very few Norse words in *Robert of Gloucester*, *Chaucer* and other literature of the South, their number in *Havelock the Dane*, and the later Northumbrian and Scotch monuments, is very large, as well as in North-English and Scotch dialects down to this day. Of Norse words still used in Scotch a few are such as *big*, (build), *carl* (man), *cleg* (gad-fly), *hoast* (cough), *ken* (know), *lift* (sky). The literary English of to-day, which dates from the fourteenth century and has for its basis the dialect of London and the Universities, contains a much smaller element than the spoken language of the North and of Scotland, and yet altogether it is considerable. Professor Skeat in his *Etymological Dictionary* mentions nearly seven hundred words of Scandinavian origin.

Some of the Scandinavian influences, as shown in Professor Egge's paper, may be summed up by the following statements: a. Some of the borrowed words crowded out the original, as *are* for *bæoth* or *sind*; *tåke* only for *niman*; *them* for *hem*,—*hem* survives in the modern provincial English *'em*, as in *I hear 'em laugh*. b. In the case of other words the meaning was changed, for example, *dwel* and *earl*, of which the present meanings are due to Scandinavian influence. c. Change in the form of many words, for example, seventh, ninth, tenth, eleventh (by

analogy), thirteenth to nineteenth. In Old English these ordinals are formed without *n*; in the Scandinavian languages they are all, except eleventh, formed with *n*. d. A similar and more wide-reaching change is seen in words, which in Old English had the vowel *ā* and in Norse the diphthong *ei*. In all such words the regular change of sound in Southern English was from *ā* to *ō*,—thus *āc*, *bān*, *hām*, *stān*, became *oak*, *bone*, *home*, *stone*. In the most northern English, however, this change has not yet taken place, the Scotch still saying *aik*, *bane*, *hame*, *stane*.

The discussion of this paper was opened by Professor George Hempl (University of Michigan), who considered the loss of the inflections important, but believed the Scandinavian influence on English was often overestimated, and who said further that whenever Professor Skeat found any difficulty with an English word he turned it over to Scandinavian influence.

Professor Julius Goebel (Leland Stanford Jr. University) had written a paper on "Heine's Relation to Wolfgang Menzel" which was read, owing to the absence of Professor Goebel, by Dr. P. O. Kern (University of Chicago). Little has been done thus far, said the writer, for the investigation of the origin and growth of the literary movement which we are accustomed to call "Young Germany;" the works that have been published on this movement were largely written from the standpoint of the partisan, and it is, therefore, extremely difficult to obtain a true historical picture of the chief figures of that period. Just as we looked at Gottsched for a long time in the way in which he had appeared to Lessing, and for many years our conception of the literary character of Nicolai was that of Herder, Goethe, and Schiller, so also of Wolfgang Menzel we possess mainly only the caricature produced by the malice and hatred of Heine, Börne, and the rest of the "Young Germans." It is the duty of an impartial history of literature to give justice to Menzel, in whom we must see the original leader of "Young Germany." His *Deutsche Litteratur*, published in 1828, gave expression for the first time to the dissatisfaction and longings of the talented young minds of that period. Professor Goebel submitted quotations from Gutzkow, Heine, and Mundt to prove that Menzel was considered the original leader of these young writers, the main

object of the paper being to prove that Heine was deeply influenced by Menzel's book on German literature,—a fact which Heine himself in later years tried to conceal. It was shown that Heine in his review of Menzel's work bore witness to the change which his views had undergone by the study of the book, and that he then adopted from Menzel the idea of a closer union between life and literature. But he later ridiculed his own review of the book by saying, "I was at that time a little boy and my greatest sport consisted in placing a flea under a microscope and showing the people its magnitude." The author went on to show that Heine's desertion of the literary principles of Romanticism began with the study of Menzel's *Deutsche Litteratur*, and that this book became the model which he imitated and copied in his own work, *Die Romantische Schule*; of course he did not copy directly, but made free use of Menzel's thoughts, it was claimed, frequently giving them a witty turn. The essayist then quoted parallel passages from Menzel and Heine to show the latter's mode of procedure.

Professor Goebel claimed further that Heine had shared Menzel's unfavorable opinion of Goethe up to the time of that poet's death. This last point, as well as the main thesis of the paper, met with considerable opposition in the discussion which was opened by Professor J. T. Hatfield (Northwestern University). It seemed to be the general feeling, as brought out by the discussion, that Menzel's influence on Heine was not so far-reaching, as maintained by Professor Goebel, and that Heine had by no means fully shared Menzel's dislike for Goethe.

The University of Minnesota was represented on the programme by Professor C. F. McClumpha with a "Comparison of Greene's *Alcida* with Lyly's *Love's Metamorphosis*." The introduction contained a survey of Greene's *Euphues*, published in 1587, and his *Menaphon*, published in 1589, and an outline of Greene's borrowings from Lyly. Lyly's style known as Euphuism was imitated by Greene in his earliest works, who looked chiefly to him for inspiration. Blount's edition of Lyly in 1632, in which six plays were published, omitted three: *The Woman in the Moone*, *The Maides Metamorphosis* and *Love's Metamorphosis*. This last play, *Love's Metamorphosis*, was

printed in 1601, and if Lyly was "buried" in 1606, it is the last play published before his death. Professor McClumpha stated that as yet we are not able to fix the date of the writing of this play. There is no reasonable doubt of Lyly's authorship. Blount can not be taken as an authority, for he omitted *The Woman in the Moone* and this is Lyly's first play. Greene's *Alcida* was entered at the Stationers' Hall, December 9, 1588. The earliest known edition of it is that of 1617. An admirer of Greene mentions it in his *Greene's Funerals*, published in London in 1594. This novel, then, was published earlier than this edition of 1617, and there is no reason to doubt that the year 1588 was its year of publication. Professor McClumpha then gave an outline of the two stories, showing the main correspondences and differences. The stories are essentially the same, namely the metamorphosis of the three maids into the stone, the bird and the rose-tree. In conclusion Professor McClumpha claimed these three points: 1. The likeness of the two stories which is self-evident, but which has hitherto been unnoticed by all reviewers, so far as he has had access to works upon these writers. 2. He would place Lyly's *Love's Metamorphosis* among his earlier works. His *Woman in the Moone* was not printed till 1597, yet in the prologue Lyly distinctly states that it is his earliest work. From a comparison of Lyly's plays it was found that *Love's Metamorphosis* has many qualities in common with this first play. It certainly has not the wit, the plot, the vivacity of his so-called later plays. Critics have ascribed these failings to its being a play of his old age, but Professor McClumpha prefers to call them the failings of youth and would place the date about 1584. 3. Passages, which agree in substance, style and phraseology, were quoted to show the interdependence of Lyly's *Love's Metamorphosis* and Greene's *Alcida*, placing such a relation beyond doubt, and the belief was expressed that Greene took his story from Lyly. Professor Martha Foote Crow (University of Chicago), in her discussion of the paper, complimented Professor McClumpha's extensive acquaintance with the authors compared, and suggested a study of the sentence-structure and the plot-structure in order to settle this question.

The next paper on the programme was entitled "The Unity of Place in the *Cid*." Owing to the absence of the writer, Professor J. E. Matzke (Leland Stanford Jr. University), it was presented by Professor C. W. Benton of the University of Minnesota. The introduction stated that it is usually conceded that the unity of place is not observed in Corneille's *Cid*, that its non-observance was one of the points criticised by Scudéry, and that this criticism, together with the Academy's sanction of it, was one of the many causes working together towards the final establishment of the law of the strict observance of the unity of place in the French theatre.

The author claimed that there can be no longer any question that the *Cid* was written for and played with the so-called multiplex decoration, which may be looked upon as an in-door adaptation of the old mystery stage. This new stage-setting brought with it important changes in the manner of acting, the most important being that actors would step forward from their particular 'mansions' to the front of the stage, and by general consent the central portion of the stage was then accepted as that particular locality where the actors in reality ought to be. A similar method of playing, according to Rigal, was utilized in the early representations of the *Cid* to give the appearance of a certain fictitious unity of place. Professor Warren (MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. x, col. 1 ff.) accepts the explanation, and advances the idea of a compromise for the unity of place,—“a compromise between the requirements of the purists and the freedom of Hardy's scenery,”—and interprets the strictures of Scudéry and of the Academy on this basis, but the arguments brought forward in support of this explanation are, however, not convincing, Professor Matzke claims, nor do they seem to bring out the true meaning of Scudéry's criticism. The author proceeded to show that an attempt on the part of Corneille to introduce a compromise for the unity of place in the *Cid* in 1636 would place him far ahead of his time. It was then made evident by a detailed examination of the action of the play that Scudéry could not criticise Corneille for non-observance of the unity of place, but that his criticism was directed against another supposed weakness of the play, the technique or handling of the multiplex decoration, which is open to serious criti-

cism. Professor Matzke's conclusions agree in general with the statement of Lotheissen, in his *Geschichte der französischen Litteratur im xvii. Jahrhundert*.

An animated discussion followed this paper, which was opened by Dr. T. L. Neff (University of Chicago) and continued by Professor E. P. Baillot (Northwestern University), Dr. R. de Poyen-Bellis (University of Chicago), and Professor J. S. Nollen (Iowa College). Dr. Neff made a slight criticism on the paper for introducing considerable matter not bearing on the main purpose, but admitted that Professor Matzke had sufficiently proved his point against the claim that Corneille was trying to establish a new and compromise substitute for the unity of place. Professor Matzke's purpose was to explain the object of Scudéry's criticism, which was to show Corneille's imperfect conception of the technique of the multiplex decoration. Dr. Neff thought Professor Matzke had pretty clearly attained his purpose, as just stated, but criticised the importance which he attached to the last two scenes of Act v in his claim that these were the most important blunder in the manipulation of the piece, as the spectators could have little idea where the actors were. There were, to be sure, some obstacles, Dr. Neff said, in the way of clearness, as the presence of Chimène indicated continuity of scene, between scenes five, six and seven; also the fact that in one breath she addresses Don Sanche in her own home, and in the next she addresses the king. But, after all, the appearance of the king and his suite from the king's mansion—this sort of appearance all through the play is used to indicate change of location—ought to show with some definiteness change of location from the house of Chimène to that of the king. Professor Baillot thought Professor Matzke was attacking not Scudéry but Professor Warren. Dr. de Poyen-Bellis claimed that the question at issue was not important, and in his remarks argued, among other things, that a Frenchman is always logical, but Professor Nollen, evidently failing to see the logical Frenchman, expressed the belief that Dr. de Poyen-Bellis had confused the development of the drama with the development of the stage.

The third paper on a Scandinavian subject was that of Professor Gisle Bothne (Luther College, Ia.) with the title "The Language of

Modern Norway." The author gave a brief account of the history of the language conditions in Norway, mentioning the various efforts that have been made towards the development of a Norwegian language, and pointing out the fact that Norway is essentially a peasant country, and claimed that the Danish language puts obstacles in the way of the peasant. Ibsen, who is more conservative than Björnson, ridicules the idea of a Norwegian language, and still no Dane would accept Ibsen's own language as Danish, for it contains many Norwegianisms. The author then spoke of the two reformatory movements that are at work at the present time,—the one in the interest of the *Landsmaal* inspired by the late Aasen, and that of Knudsen for the Dano-Norwegian side. The *Landsmaal* is based on: 1. the western dialects in Norway (namely, those, as Professor Bothne claims, that have best preserved the forms of the parent speech, Norwegian-Icelandic); and 2. an artificial language,—an attempt to write all the dialects of Norway in a common way. There are in Norway, according to the author of the paper, two hundred young people's societies in which this new language is used, and an effort is being made to establish a Gymnasium where Danish will be refused admittance and the *Landsmaal* used exclusively, but there is strong opposition among the friends of Dano-Norwegian. The principles underlying the Dano-Norwegian movement are: 1. the Danish language must, in Norway, be written the way it is spoken by the Norwegians of culture,—and the difference between Norwegian and Danish pronunciation is very great; and 2. for the many foreign,—and in Danish are to be found numerous German words particularly,—must be substituted purely Norwegian words from Norwegian dialects. In the Dano-Norwegian, commonly called Norwegian, there are seven thousand words not found in Danish. Professor S. W. Cutting (University of Chicago) made a few remarks upon this paper.

Dr. Karl Pietsch (University of Chicago) presented a paper that gave evidence of much original research; it had for its subject "Notes on Romance Syntax." The topics considered were: 1. Italian *cui*, nominative. 2. Old-Spanish *nadi*, subject, with the plural of the verb. 3. Statement composed of noun and

relative clause. 4. Italian *chi* with an antecedent. 5. Old-French *quels*, possessive.

English claimed the next paper, "The Relation of the *Knights Tale* to *Palamon and Arcite*," by Professor George Hempl (University of Michigan). It dealt in detail with one of the 'counts' made by the same writer in a paper read at the meeting in New Haven in 1895. It was shown that Chaucer's *Palamon and Arcite* is no longer the mystical thing we have supposed it to be, inasmuch as the larger part of it is the larger part of the *Knights Tale* as we have it. Chaucer long ago wrote a story of *Palamon and Arcite*, based upon Boccaccio, which he rewrote for the *Knights Tale*; we have no copy of the original, only an Italian version. The revised portions make up only about twenty-eight per cent, the inferior parts being those which Chaucer allowed to stand. The first twenty-six lines, for example, are unrevised. The *Knights Tale* is generally considered Chaucer's best production, still the larger part of it is the work of the poet in his immaturity.

Professor Hatfield (Northwestern University) then read a spirited paper on the "Earliest Poems of Wilhelm Müller," the substance of which was about as follows: Müller's first published poems occurred in the collection *Bundesblüthen*, a joint volume of poems issued in 1815 by Blankensee, Kalckreuth, Studnitz, Hensel and himself. The volume is exceedingly rare, and was entered under a wrong title in the Royal Library in Berlin, as Professor Hatfield accidentally discovered. The only other copy the author of the paper has been able to find is in the British Museum. Müller's contribution includes twenty titles, the last number being a group of eighteen short epigrams. The poems were considered somewhat in detail, and the influence of Gleim, Bürger, Goethe and Schiller noted. At this point and later Professor Hatfield read several selections. The epigrams, which, with one exception are in the elegiac metre, show a different treatment from that which Müller adopted later, after having himself edited Logau. One of them, Professor Hatfield said, confirms the interpretation of a later epigram "Bav und Mav" as meaning 'Bavius und Maevius,'—two inferior Latin poets, enemies of Virgil and Horace. Five "Romanzen"

show Müller's early effort at writing in the style of popular poetry. The chief new light which the collection sheds upon Müller, Professor Hatfield continued, is that it puts him, for the first time, among the poets of the War of Liberation. His themes and style are very close to Körner, Rückert and Arndt. The "Bardismus" of the eighteenth century is also plainly perceptible. Some light is shed upon Müller's personality by the subject-matter of these poems, which must be often taken as autobiographical; some of the allusions are very hard to interpret. We see also much influence of the Romantic School and of the *Minnelied*, but still more the strong influence of the *Volkslied*. The prevailing note, as in Uhland's earlier lyrics, is overwrought melancholy and pensive sentimentality. Müller candidly expresses all sides of his nature, and from this candor is to be explained the fact that he was able gradually to eliminate the weaker elements and develop the better ones.

In opening the discussion of this well-received paper, Dr. P. S. Allen (University of Chicago) paid a high tribute to Professor Hatfield's knowledge of Müller. The discussion was continued by Professor von Klenze of the same institution and the author, Professor von Klenze arguing that Müller did not understand the spirit of the *Volkslied*, and that its influence on him was overestimated.

It was regretted that Professor Ewald Fluegel (Leland Stanford Jr. University), the author of the last paper announced on the programme, "Bacon's *Historia Literaria*," was absent, and as the paper itself did not arrive in time to be presented, the present writer is unable to give a synopsis of it.

The officers elected for 1898 are:—

For President: C. Alphonso Smith (University of Louisiana).

For Secretary-Treasurer: H. Schmidt-Wartenberg (University of Chicago).

For First Vice-Pres.: Ewald Fluegel (Leland Stanford Jr. University).

For Second Vice-Pres.: Gustaf E. Karsten (University of Indiana).

For Third Vice-Pres.: Raymond Weeks (University of Missouri).

For Members of Council:

James T. Hatfield (Northwestern University);
Albert E. Jack (Lake Forest University);

James D. Bruner (University of Chicago);
Charles Bundy Wilson (State University of Iowa).

For Executive Committee:

The Secretary;

Raymond Weeks (University of Missouri).

Ewald Fluegel (Leland Stanford Jr. University).

Of the other business accomplished the following is of general interest. A resolution was adopted to the effect that it is the sense of the Central Division that a joint meeting of the two sections of the Modern Language Association of America should be held once in four years.

The Secretary was requested to provide for a pedagogical and phonetic session at the next meeting.

For the next annual meeting invitations were received and read from five institutions. The question of place of meeting in 1898 was referred to the Executive Committee.

Before adjournment a resolution of thanks to the officers of Northwestern University, the University Guild, the Evanston Club, the Country Club, and the local committee, for their very kind and generous hospitality, was unanimously adopted by a rising vote.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

State University of Iowa.

SPANISH PUBLICATIONS.

Lingua e letteratura spagnuola delle origini.

By EGIDIO GORRA. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1898, 80, pp. xvii+430.

FOR many years scholars have felt the need of a suitable text book for the study of Old Spanish language and literature, and it is gratifying to see that at last the work of compiling such a book has been undertaken by a man whose name is well known in the field of Romance studies. The little manual of Monaci and D'Ovidio, as well as the later *Testi* of Monaci, have been practically inaccessible for several years, while Lemcke's *Spanische Literaturgeschichte* and Keller's *Altspanisches Lesebuch*, in spite of their several excellent qualities, fail to meet the requirements of the present time. Consequently, Gorra, feeling the need of a suitable handbook for Italian students of Spanish, has prepared the treatise

which forms the basis of the present review.

The author appreciates so fully the needs of the time and is, withal, so modest in regard to the aims of his own publication, that it will be well to quote his own words. After speaking of the excellent work for other Romance languages by Monaci, Bartsch, Meyer, Crescini, Appel, Foerster and Paris, he remarks:

"Allo scopo di supplire in parte a tale mancanza io misi insieme questo libro, il quale non aspira ad essere se non un tentativo ed un incitamento ad altri a far meglio. Poichè non mi dissimulai le difficoltà dell'impresa. Manca degli antichi testi spagnuoli una edizione critica; manca della lingua arcaica un vocabolario, e, se si toglie lo studio eccellente ma troppo sommario del Baist, manca una vera e propria grammatica scientifica."

The book is divided into three parts: *Introduzione Grammaticale*, pp. 1-174; *Testi*, pp. 175-365; *Glossario* pp. 367-426. The first part is a study of Phonology and Morphology, the second part contains selections of texts arranged in chronological order and extending from the earliest monuments to the end of the fourteenth century, and the third part is devoted to a vocabulary which the author intends to be "abondante anzichè no."

The book proper opens with an "elenco alfabetico delle principali pubblicazioni linguistiche intorno allo spagnuolo arcaico," and though the list does not pretend to be exhaustive, we are struck by several important omissions: Diez' *Wörterbuch* is mentioned, but we look in vain for Körting's *Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch*; Gessner's study on the "Personal Pronouns" is found but his studies on "Possessive, Demonstrative, Interrogative and Relative Pronouns" are missing. If Mugica's *Gramática del Castellano Antiguo* is considered worthy of mention, we should certainly expect to find such works as Cuervo's *Diccionario de Construcción y Régimen* and Gröber's *Vulgarlateinische Substrate in Romanischen Wörtern*.² Finally, no bibliography can be complete without Viñaza's *Biblioteca Histórica de la Filología Castellana*.

To call the linguistic study an "Introduzione Grammaticale" gives no fair idea of the scope and value of this part of the book, for it consists of a very complete and well-arranged treatise on phonology and morphology. The

¹ *Zts. für Rom. Phil.*, xvii, pp. 329-352; xviii, pp. 449-498.

² *Archiv. für Lat. Lex.*, Vols. i-vi.

author tells us that his aim has been "raccolgere e vagliare i risultati che si sono finora ottenuti," and as a result, we have a treatise of inestimable value to the student of Spanish philology. Certain chapters, to be sure, are not as thorough as one would like to have them, and this is especially true for the treatment of "Personal" and "Possessive Pronouns," while in the pages devoted to the "Verb" many important forms have been omitted. In at least two cases the arrangement of material seems somewhat illogical; in the first place, the remarks on the "accent" in verbs occur in the chapter "Il Presente," though the remarks are by no means confined to the present tense; in the second place, the treatment of "consonants (labial, dental, guttural and liquid)+i" should have formed a separate chapter instead of being wedged into the chapter on "Gutturals." The "Introduzione Grammaticale" does not include a study of 'Syntax,' and as the footnotes to the texts fail to treat this subject, the student is often at a loss to solve many difficulties.

Bearing in mind that the book is intended for beginners, it seems advisable to call attention to some few points which may cause confusion or misunderstanding. The chapter on the "Alfabeto e Pronunzia" is conservative; nevertheless, it is by no means certain that "Le vocali atone sono sempre brevi e chiuse" (p. 3). *H* is said to have been pronounced "più o men fortemente nello spagnuolo antico" (p. 8), which statement is rather too restricted since some sort of aspiration was used in the sixteenth century. "S è sempre sordo o aspro nello spagnuolo moderno" (p. 9), but in reality *s* is voiced when followed by a voiced consonant.

In regard to the phonology and morphology the following are noted:

P. 13, note, 2: Substantives in *-ágin* are classed with the cases where *a* shows attraction with *i* of the following syllable, from which it would seem that Gorra's development is *ferráginem* > *ferraigne* > *ferren*. It is more probable, however, that *g* disappeared before the fall of the post-tonic vowel, otherwise, we must suppose that *gn* > *n* > *n*, which is improbable. The proper explanation is given p. 60. P. 14, note 3: Judging from the remark on Meyer-Lübke's theory concerning the ter-

mination *-menta*, Gorra has overlooked Baist's statement on the same subject.³ In treating tonic *e*, some mention should be made of such verb forms as *sirvo*, *pido*, etc., inasmuch as no explanation is given in the "Morphology." P. 16, § 23: The Old Spanish forms *cree*, *vee*, *fee* should be noted in connection with *credit*, *vidit*, *fidem*. P. 17, note 1: *libro* is omitted from the list of learned words which preserve Latin *l*. P. 17, l. 13: Gassner explains *nieve* (*nlvem*) as being influenced by *hielo* which explanation is better than that of Baist and Foerster, and more exact than that of Meyer-Lübke. P. 19, § 28: The law for reduction of *ue* to *e*, which according to Gorra is "non ancora ben determinate," has been partially formulated by the present writer.⁴ The form *pes* (*pues*) is curious and is possibly a misprint in the document from which it is taken. P. 21, l. 16: *Deluvio* and *estudio* are learned and do not illustrate the law *o+vok.+i>u*. P. 36, § 57, speaks of post-tonic *a*, *e*, *o*, *i* and adds "le due prime tendono a permanere, mentre l'ultima di regola si dilegua." The examples cited to prove this statement deal only with *a*, *o*, *i* and the author doubtless intends the remark to refer to *a*, *e*, *o* since *i>e* and *i* does not occur as post-tonic. P. 40: *Fuelle* and *muelle* are exceptions to the rule that *e* falls after *ll*. It should also be noted that forms like *anoch*, *nuef*, *off* are confined to a rather limited sphere in O. S. P. 48: Under "Initial *f*," there should be some mention of exceptional forms like *fè*, *fenchir*, *fiesta*, *fui*, instead of dismissing all exceptions as "learned or due to dialect influence." Furthermore, if *f* in compounds is "trattato come all' iniziale," we should expect *confuerto* instead of *conhuerto*. P. 50, note 1: *Arch* is cited as an example of *t>ch*. This word is probably taken from the *Poema del Cid*, where it is doubtless a scribal error for *arth* or *art*. P. 50, § 76: *Hastio* (<*fastidium*) and *porfiar* (<*perfidia*), are rather examples of *d̄l>y* than of fall of intervocalic *d*. The same paragraph cites Lat. *p̄dem*, to illustrate both the rule that intervocalic *d* remains in post-tonic syllable, and the rule that *d* falls in the termination *-ede*. P. 51, l. 28, suggests **codula* as the etymon of *cola*; now the development of *codula* would

have been *codula>codla>colda*. Furthermore, Portuguese has *coda*, *coa*, and Spanish the diminutive *codilla*. Is it not probable that *cola* shows a remodelling by influence of *culo* (<*cūlum*)? P. 58, note 2: The author seems to reject Horning's theory that final *z* was voiceless in O.S., and we should have liked to see his reasons for supposing the opposite. P. 60, § 90: *Guerrear* is cited as an example of fall of intervocalic *g*. P. 67, § 99: *Ya* (<*yam*) is an exception to the rule that final *m>n* in monosyllables. P. 67, note 2: The forms *bueña*, *bueños*, *oñores*, *leño* and *laña* are mentioned as occurring in the *Poema del Cid*. In the first three we see a scribal error or simply a variant having the value of single *n*, while in the last two the *n* is palatal and the simple explanation of this phenomenon would not have been amiss. P. 69, § 104 states that in Andalusia "*l̄* (<*ll*) procede sino a *y*." Evidently the author has never lived in Spain, otherwise he would know that *y* is in much more general use. P. 72, l. 15: The development of *motilum* into *moch*, represents metathesis similar to *retina>rienda*, cf. p. 85 note. P. 75, § 105: The rule that "il *l* cade dopo vocale atona" is illustrated by only one example *insiemo* (<*insimul*), and there is no mention of such exceptions as *facil*, *trebol*, *arbol*, *marmol*, etc. P. 92, § 124: *Sanies*, *materies*, *dies* are classed under Latin third declension instead of Latin fifth. P. 106: *Mi*, *ti*, *si* occur in the table of atonic pronouns with no comment or explanation. P. 111, l. 17: *Sas* as fem. plural of *sa* is probably a misprint for *sues*. P. 164, l. 20: Between the preterit forms *vido* and *vió* there existed an intermediate stage *vio*, and a confusion of the forms *vio* and *vió* is met with in many cases in the texts.

As mentioned above, the texts are arranged in chronological order, and the period of transition from Popular Latin into Spanish is illustrated by several dated documents of the eight, ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries. The selections from Old Spanish poetry represent all the works contained in Janer's *Poetas Castellanos anteriores al Siglo XV*, except the *Revelacion de un Hermitano*, *Tratado de la Doctrina*, *Proverbios Morales del Rabbi don Sem Tob*, and the *Vida de San Ildefonso*, but the author has based his texts on Janer only when better editions were not

³ *Kritische Jahresberichte*, i, p. 533.

⁴ *Phonol. of the Span. Dial. of Mex. City*, p. 20.

in existence. The other poetic selections represent the *Crónica Rimada*, *Misterio de los Reyes Magos* and *Romance de Bernardo del Carpio*. The passages in prose are *De los Diez Mandamientos*, *Anales Toledanos*, *Fuero Juzgo*, *Estoria de los Godos*, *La Gran Conquista del Ultramar*, and several selections from the works of Alfonso el Sabio and Juan Manuel. The choice of texts in both prose and verse is well made, and the passages are of sufficient length to give a fair idea of the literary and linguistic value of the originals.

Each selection is preceded by an introduction which mentions the date of composition and the various editions of the work, stating definitely from which edition the extract is taken. Furthermore, there is a short critical estimate and bibliography, and in several cases a brief *résumé* of the contents of the original. As a rule, Gorra has used the best and most reliable editions for texts, but in several instances this is not the case. The selections from the *Crónica General* are based on the edition of Valladolid, 1604, instead of on that of Zamora 1541, and the Gregorio Lopez edition of the *Siete Partidas* (Valladolid, 1587) is used instead of the Academy of History edition, Madrid, 1807. In both instances, however, the author is familiar with the better text, and is compelled by force of circumstances to use the less reliable one.

In still other cases the best editions are not used and here it is apparently due to the author's ignorance concerning their existence; for example, Baist's paleographic edition of the *Misterio de los Reyes Magos* is neither used nor mentioned, and a much more serious mistake is made in the *Estoria de los Godos*, where the selections are taken from Rios' *Literatura*, vol. iii, pp. 424-426. As might be expected from the source, the latter selections contain numerous errors, all of which could have been corrected had Gorra used the edition (and reprint of the same ms.) by Paz y Melia,⁶ in which work will be found a mention of an earlier edition by Lidforss. Gorra apparently accepts Rios' conclusion that the author was Jimenez de Rada himself, but Paz y Melia has reached the opposite conclusion. Before dismissing the *Estoria de los Godos*, it should

be noted that "CAP. xxxvii, *De los bienes de Espanna*" should read "CAP. xxxvi. *De los reyes godos, Egica*;" "Cap. xciv, *Commo uençieron xriptianos*," should read "CAP. xcv, *Los golpes*;" and the first selection, p. 285, while properly numbered "CAP. L." should have as its title "*Commo legaron paganos*," instead of "*Del Rey don Alfonso*." Gorra evidently took the chapter headings from the *Ilustracion* in Rios, vol. iii, p. 665.

It is rather a curious fact that at no place in his book does the author mention Menendez-Pelayo, *Antología de Poetas Líricos Castellanos*,⁷ the first two volumes of which contain the complete text of *Romance de Lope de Moros*, and the *Danza General de la Muerte*, together with several of Gorra's selections from Berceo and the Arcipreste de Fita. Menendez' work is also interesting in the present connection on account of its sympathetic study of the above mentioned poets, as well as for its critical remarks on Old Spanish poetry in general.

The remarks on the *Poema del Cid* fail to mention the editions of both Bello⁸ and Lidforss,⁹ and while speaking of the Cid it seems pertinent to ask: Why is it that scholars so frequently refer to the one manuscript of the *Poema* and fail to mention the sixteenth century copy of this manuscript? The older document is absolutely illegible in many places which fact makes the copy of inestimable value.¹⁰ Let it also be noted in passing that the only extant manuscript of the *Crónica Rimada* is by no means as bad as editors and commentators would have us believe, for the document is legibly, even carefully written.

The introduction to the *Poema de Fernan Gonzalez* contains no mention of Gallardo's edition, and states that the poem

"fu per la primera volte publicato a Parigi nel 1876 dal Janer, che lo reproduse poscia nel più volte citato volume 57° della *Biblioteca de auctores españoles*."

The date 1876 is clearly a misprint, and the above passage is probably based on Monaci,

⁷ Six volumes have appeared, Madrid, 1890-1896.

⁸ An accessible edition is vol. ii. of the *Obras completas*, Santiago de Chile, 1881.

⁹ The text of the poem appeared in *Acta Universitatis Lundensis*, vol. xxxi, 1895, and the Introduction and Notes, *ibid.*, vol. xxxii, 1896.

¹⁰ The copy is now in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, under the number 'R. 200.'

⁵ *Das Dreikönigspiel, Abdruck der Handschrift*, Erlangen, 1887.

⁶ *Doc. Inéd. para la Hist. de Esp.*, vol. lxxxviii.

who gives the date as 1856. Furthermore, though Janer may have published the first complete text of the Escorial manuscript, large portions of the same manuscript were published by the Spanish translators of Bouterwek in 1804, and by Revilla in 1842, to say nothing of extracts from another lost manuscript published by Argote de Molina 1575, and Prudencio de Sandoval 1615.

The selection entitled *Romance de Lope de Moros* is the lyric *Poeme d'Amour* published by Morel-Fatio.¹¹ Gorra follows Monaci in supposing that this and the *Débat du vin et de l'eau*¹² constitute a single poem, and the title is taken from the closing verse of the latter: "Lupus me fecit de Moros." The discussion of the *Crónica General* fails to comment on the important relation which this prose work bears to the Old Spanish romances. Likewise the bibliography contains no mention of Menendez Pidal, *Leyenda de los Infantes de Lara*, and without this great work there can be no satisfactory study of Alfonso's Cronicle.

We come now to a consideration of the texts themselves and of the method employed by Gorra in editing them for class use. The method (or lack of method) is clearly set forth in the Preface:

"E per quel che riguarda la pubblicazione dei testi io mi proposi di riprodurre fedelmente la lezione seguita nelle edizioni dalle quali essi prevengono, dal che deriva quella varietà o, direi, incoerenza nella grafia e nell'uso degli accenti alla quale è bene che l'alunno si avvezzi sin dappincipio."

Now in regard to such a system as that set forth above, only one criticism can be made; namely, that it cannot be too severely condemned. To be sure, such a system saves a vast amount of labor on the part of the editor, but considering the crude state of our knowledge of Old Spanish and the dearth of satisfactory editions, time is far from being wasted when occupied in preparing satisfactory texts or, at least, texts as satisfactory as circumstances will permit. When an editor can make use of such editions as those of Morel-Fatio, Gräfenberg, Baist, etc., he may be justified in reproducing the material as he finds it. But is there

any excuse for reproducing the careless orthography and accentuation of Janer and Gayangos, together with their many vicious readings and mistakes? And is it proper to utilize the older printed editions without making some effort to correct or comment on the most obvious misprints?

In the matter of orthography and accent, Gorra is far from adhering to his system of faithfully reproducing the original text. To mention in detail the numerous inconsistencies would be useless—a few general remarks must suffice. *U* is often represented by *v* and the inverse process is quite as frequent; the cedilla is omitted with *c*; verbs, adverbs, etc., are found without the accent which occurs in the original, while, on the other hand, accents occur of which no trace can be found in the edition from which the extract is taken. The selections from the *De los Diez Mandamientos* and *Crónica General*, in which no accents should occur, contain such forms as *avrás*, *matarás*, *dirás*, *mató*, and *fué pobló, tomó, allá, así, después*. But even here the author has not consistently violated his own rule, cf., *juraras*, p. 224, l. 5, and *fue*, p. 296, l. 11, *despues*, p. 295, l. 15. The above remarks will suffice to give an idea of the carelessness which characterizes the book from beginning to end.

In some few cases the footnotes contain emendations to the texts; for example, *cuérda* for *cuerta*, p. 196, l. 7; *riso* for *viso*, p. 242 end; *nado* for *naçido*, p. 345, l. 16. In other cases appropriate corrections are made without comment; for example, *mucho* for *muchó*, p. 247, l. 30; *una* for *un*, p. 250, l. 8; *priso* for *prisó*, p. 255, l. 18. Finally, a number of text-emendations are suggested in the "Vocabulary," and in nearly all such cases the reference to the passage in question is given. Here again, however, we notice an unpardonable lack of method. If *nacido* is changed to *nado* (p. 345, l. 16), for the rhyme, why not make the same change, p. 268, l. 32? Why should *sañor* (p. 297, l. 5), *avades* (p. 297, l. 28), *llemástesme* (p. 365, l. 5), stand uncorrected in the texts, and without comment in the vocabulary? Why should *Poema de Yusuf*, copla 60, read *se era* and *anda mi es cativo*, when the author was acquainted with Morf's edition, and thus might have emended to *si era* and *ante es mi cativo*?

¹¹ *Romania*, Vol. xvi, pp. 368-374.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 375-379.

The following are a few more of the many cases where an emendation seems desirable: p. 213, l. 22, for *ma ho* read *mal o*; p. 214, l. 5, read *(de) dellos*; p. 232, l. 1, the metre demands *deçirte* (= *deçir te hê*) for *deçirt*. In the selection from the *Crónica General*, p. 299 end, we read: "E dizen algunos que cató por agüeros e que ovo conseja a diestra de Burgos e que la ovo a siniestra." This obscure passage should be corrected in the light of the *Poema del Cid*, lines 11-12, (p. 188). The *Poema de Yusuf*, copla 58d, (p. 304) reads: "De piedras preciosas muy bien lo agastaron." Janer's variant *afeitaron* is preferable when we compare copla 91 c (p. 307): "E de piedras preciosas muy lo afeitaron," and the same comparison would naturally lead us to supply *bien* in the last mentioned verse. P. 253, l. 19, metre and syntax demand *los* in "Besso al rey manos."

In the *Poema de Fernan Gonzalez*, p. 268 l. 27, for *quero* read *quiero*; p. 269, l. 24, for *lo quero* read *lo quinto*; p. 269, l. 14, for *no* read *non*; p. 271, l. 10, for *ay* read *oy*,—all of which readings are found in Gallardo's edition. Likewise Paz y Melia's edition of the *Estoria de los Godos* makes the following improvement on Gorra's text: p. 284, l. 16, for *quis* read *quiso*; p. 284 l. 19, for *pud* read *pudo*; p. 284, l. 19, for *coibdo* read *cuido*; p. 285, l. 18, for *foé* read *fué*.

"Chiude il volume un glossario che volli fosse abbondante anzichè no, sia perchè i dizionarii della lingua moderna non bastano all' intelligenza di un testo antico, e sia perchè volli che in certa guisa esso riuscisse un compimento e una conferma della introduzione grammaticale per quelle forme che non vi trovarono posto, o che per le loro varietà grafiche sono peculiari ai singoli testi. E qui credetti mio dovere di essere il più possibilmente completo e di segnare sinceramente con un punto interrogativo quei vocaboli che mi riuscirono oscuri o di dubbio significato, rimando in tal caso alla pagina in cui essi si leggono"

The vocabulary consists of fifty-nine double column pages, and from the passage just quoted it seems probable that it was the author's intention to give a complete list of all words occurring in the texts. This opinion is strengthened when we find in the vocabulary such modern words as *abrir*, *ahora*, *alabar*, *amar-gura*, etc.; numerous inflected forms of regular

as well as irregular verbs (for example, *entrar*, *entrara*, *entrare*, *entró*, *escuchar*, *escuchádes*, *escuchó*, etc.); feminine and plural forms of nouns and adjectives; and variant spellings in b-v, c-ç-s-z, etc. But if such was the intention of the vocabulary, it by no means accomplishes its aim, since fully one third of the words are omitted to say nothing of proper names which the author does not pretend to include in the list. Furthermore, the different 'parts of speech' are not designated, and even the homonyms are treated under a single heading; for example, "*a a*, con; ha."—"so suo; loro; sotto; io sono." As may be supposed, such a system presents difficulties especially when applied to the inflected forms of verbs; for example, the future subjunctive, which has no counterpart in Italian, is sometimes translated by the present subjunctive, sometimes by the imperfect subjunctive; the similarity of certain forms of the Italian present indicative and imperative not infrequently cause the definitions to be obscure; finally, the infinitive as a rule, is not mentioned at all unless this form actually occurs in the texts.

The following are some of the cases where the definitions are incorrect or incomplete: *acomienço* is not a single word 'principio' but is equivalent to *(h)a comienço* (Appol. 183, c.); *Aletanis* is not a 'nome propio' but is Lat. *adletaneus*, Span. *aledaño* meaning 'limiting' or 'bounding' (p. 183, lines 25, 30); *aquel* 'colui,' but p. 355, l. 15, it is feminine and equivalent to *á aquel*; *auie* (p. 284, l. 10) is not mentioned as an impersonal verb; *calle* is given as pres. subj. 3, but p. 352, l. 34, which is probably the only occurrence of the form, it is in the first person; *case* is not 'che si acassi' in *Cid*, l. 282, while in many other passages in the book the verb is not reflexive; *coyta* (p. 229, l. 30) is 'grief, pain, affliction,' not 'pensiero, animo'; *departimiento* (p. 352, l. 22) does not mean 'departure' but 'talk, conversation' and even 'wrangling'; *el* is mentioned as definite article and pronoun, but there is no mention of it as a contraction for *en el*: "o si mató nino chiquiello el vientre de se madre," p. 224, l. 28; *emiente* is not a verb form, but is equivalent to *en miente*: *vengase te emiente*, p. 224, l. 10; *a la larga* (p. 353, l. 27) should be mentioned in connection with *larga*; *morir*

has also the meaning 'to kill' (269, l. 8); *partiemos* is not pres. ind., *Cid*, l. 1116; under *pecado* should be mentioned the meaning 'devil, satan,' and also the exclamation *mal pecado*; *pecador* is not necessarily feminine (p. 224, l. 9); *pud* is not a contraction for *pudo* but for *pude* (p. 284, l. 19); *seguye* p. 265, l. 1, is imperfect indicative, not present indicative; The only meaning given for *sellar* is 'sigilare,' in face of which it would be somewhat difficult to translate p. 354, l. 12: 'la mula tienen sellada'; *tablado* 'palco' which is rather a meagre and unsatisfactory definition for this characteristic word, *visquíredes* is translated as a fut. ind; *conio*, *Poema del Cid* l. 293, which has been the subject of so much previous comment, is emended to *comió* though this meaning is hardly acceptable when considered in connection with the preceding and following verses of the poem, and a somewhat similar criticism may be made to *livianas*, *Libro de Alexandre*, copla 1611; *tocas*, *Romance de Lope de Moros*, l. 18, is imp. subj. 3, and there is ellipsis of the conjunction 'que':

Cubierto era de tal mesura
No lo tocas la calentura.

To attempt to give a complete list of the words omitted in the vocabulary would exceed the scope of the present review, consequently mention will be made only of such forms as might cause difficulty to the beginner.

Verbs: *aforzar*, *anduvieron*, *annadir*, *adrá*, *apresso*, *aví*, *aves* (*avedes*), *colpar*, *combater*, *conquistó*, *creder*, *credió*, *demoremos*, *diç*, *diçien*, *dist*, *do*, *diou*, *erades*, *esponer*, *estant*, *faces*, *façedes*, *fasientes*, *fazet*, *feçieron*, *fiades*, *foe*, *foron*, *fura*, *havie*, *hedes*, *hobieron*, *hovo*, *morrá*, *morrán*, *ode*, *ouier*, *ouiemos*, *ouieron*, *poden*, *podió*, *pregar*, *posiesse*, *quisies*, *salló*, *sedía*, *sois*, *tenrríe*, *terrá*, *tien*, *tolgamos*, *trovar*, *valler*, *vehfen*, *veniera*, *vioron*, *viron*, *yt*; also such contractions as *darte*, *decirt(e)*, *diol*, etc., (for *darte hé*, etc). Other important omissions are: *ad*, *adó*, *alia* (=otra), *alquantos*, *apresso*, *apuesto*, *ardit*(adj.) *avant*, *aveniment*, *ben*, *blanqua*, *cascuna*, *colpe*, *çient*, *deque*, *dies don* (=doña), *duc*, *ducá*, *dulz*, *dotri*, *empues*, *fame*, *franc*, *fuert*, *gent*(adj.), *garzon*, *gientes*, *huna*, *labeledos*, *li*, *lis*, *maestre*, *magar*, *mesmo*, *morte*, *nengun*, *novel*, *oram*(=orame), *olhos*, *otri*, *paraulas*, *piedes*, *plus*, *prinçep*, *prosa*

qua, *res*, *ren*, *se*(=su), *sue*(=su), *se*(=si), *sén*(=se en), *senor*(=señora), *tot*, *yol*.

The misprints in the book are many in number, and without attempting to correct those cases where *u* and *v* have been interchanged, and accents and cedillas omitted, the following have been noted:

P. 15, l. 20, has *sei* for *seis*; p. 16, l. 4, *soberbia* for *soberbio*; p. 20, note 1, *gueco*, *güey* for *güeco*, *güey*; p. 24, l. 19, 'æ è trattato come e' for 'come ē'; p. 27, l. 8, '42, ð, ð, ð' for '42, ð, ð, ð'; p. 33, l. 14, *cobdicia* for *cobdicia*; p. 47, note 1, *enoraguena* for *enoragüena* and *fabüena* for *fabueña*; p. 54, l. 1, *vejica* for *vejica*; p. 83, note 2, *diarexis* omitted in *gue*, *guevo*, *guerto*, *güeste*, also *-guela* l. 13; p. 108, l. 1, *autel* for *antel*, p. 132, l. 21, omit accent in *cerrámos* *cerráis*; p. 138, l. 16, *-ábais* for *-ábais*; p. 146, last line, *eslit* for *estit*; p. 148, l. 16, *meti* for *metió*; p. 159, l. 16, *estedieron* for *estidieron*; p. 159, l. 9, *trujstes* for *trujistes*; p. 189, l. 16, *fuerças* for *fuerça*; p. 198, l. 18, *quierren* for *querren*; p. 218, l. 9, *donas* for *duenas*; p. 219, l. 11, *en en* for *en*; p. 220, l. 9, *ben* for *bien*; p. 220, l. 16, *De* for *D[e]*; p. 220, l. 32, *ben* for *b[i]en*; p. 221, l. 28, *commingo* for *commigo*; p. 222, l. 22, *per* for *por*; p. 222, l. 25, *nieu* for *niev[e]*; p. 223, l. 1, *füente* for *fuent*; p. 223, l. 6, *vino* for *v[i]no*; l. 13, *des* for *de*; p. 223, l. 24, *lo* for *los*; p. 224, l. 6, *esto* for *este*, *perjuros* for *perjurios*; p. 222 l. 31, *forni[ca]cion* for *fornicio*; p. 225, l. 8, *desto* for *destos*; p. 225, l. 11, *ocisior*, for *oc[c]isor*; p. 226, l. 10, *guarda* for *garde*; p. 228, l. 24, *apriso* for *apresso* or *aprisa*; p. 229, l. 17, *milagros* for *miraglos*; p. 229, l. 19, *par* for *por*; p. 232, l. 23, *duraré* for *durare*;¹³ p. 233, l. 5, *lo* for *los*; p. 233, l. 28, *comno* for *commo*; p. 238, l. 6, *juico* for *juiçio*; p. 238, l. 19, *verrá* for *verá*; p. 240, l. 10, *espanteredes* for *espan-taredes*; p. 242, l. 25, *tota* for *toda*; p. 244, l. 7, *qua* for *que*; p. 245, l. 6, *318* for *317*; p. 248, l. 31, *fijo* for *Fijo*; p. 254, l. 26, *vihuella* for *vihuella*; p. 256, l. 4, *el* for *al*; p. 259, l. 38, *Gonçale* for *Gonçalo*; p. 259, l. 39, *San* for *Sant*; p. 264, l. 5, *cumo* for *como*; p. 268, l. 5, *ny'* for *ay*; p. 272, l. 19, *Dic* for *Diç*; p. 279, l. 30, *lós* for *los*; p. 280, l. 4, *prencipe* for *principe*; p. 280, l. 17, omit *sea* last word; p. 281, l. 5, *antiguos* for *antigos*; p. 281, l. 13, between the

¹³ Future Subjunctive 3.

words 'comandamientos' and 'onde' about twelve lines of text have been omitted. p. 282, l. 25, envizado for enrizado; p. 184, l. 29, come for como; p. 290, l. 11, Alonso for Alfonso;¹⁴ p. 291, l. 13, vivan for buian; p. 291, l. 17, passar for pasar; p. 291, l. 9, add., 'e los escolares'; p. 291, l. 29, omit las; p. 292, l. 4, omo for ome; p. 292, l. 11, levante for leuanta; p. 292, l. 19, establecer for establecer; p. 292, l. 22, quo for que; p. 292, l. 30, establecidos for establecidos; p. 293, l. 4, juzees for juezes; p. 293, l. 14, Ma for Mas; p. 293, l. 20, sobredichos for sobredicho; p. 294, l. 26, les for las; p. 294, l. 30, pos and quelquier for por and qualquier; p. 296, l. 6, Reys for Rey; p. 296, l. 14, da for de; p. 296, l. 31, carta for cartas; p. 297, l. 9, recebir for recibir; p. 298, l. 25, poc for pocas; p. 300, l. 17 fincharlas for finchirlas; p. 301, l. 12, sobro for sobre; p. 301, l. 24, semos for sennos; p. 301, l. 25, piedras for pedras; p. 302, l. 13, guisar omitted before donna; p. 302, l. 17, totas for todas; p. 302, l. 32, litter. for liter.; p. 305, l. 4, alombrada for alombraba; p. 308, l. next to last line, vol. clxiii for vol. xliii; p. 310, l. 13, mançana for maçana; p. 310 last line, dásperas for áspervas; p. 311, l. 8, de for del; p. 311, l. 25, Tun for tan; p. 313, l. 32, compana for compañía; p. 313, l. 34, acerca for la cerca; p. 316, l. 9, Hierusalem for Hierusalen; p. 316, l. 23, quisiesse for quisiere; p. 321, l. 11, quisiéstelas for quiesiesteslas; p. 321, l. 30, omit su; p. 323, l. 19, faxer for facer; p. 323, l. 33, lxxv capítulo, for lxxvi capítulo; p. 324, l. 8, paren for parece; p. 324, l. 17, Ma for Mas; p. 355, l. 37, flajamente for flojamente; p. 325, l. 30, quo for que; p. 327, l. 19, samejasen for semejasen; p. 329, l. 4, per for por; p. 332, l. 4, mil and tresçientos for mill and treçientos; p. 332 third line from end vol. li for vol. lvii; p. 334, l. 10, fáseslo for faseslos; p. 335, l. 18, ligere for ligero; p. 337, l. 32, De for Do; p. 338, l. 9, 588 for 593; p. 338, l. 21, pena for penas; p. 339, l. 28, 1592 for 1591; p. 346, three lines from end, estes for estas; p. 348, l. 2, se for es; p. 350, l. 19, Gran for Grant; p. 352, l. 24, tant and vento for tan and viento; p. 353, l. 14, fabláre for fablaré; p. 353, l. 31, per for por; p. 356, l. 10, 72 for 71; p. 359, l. 19, Ja for Ya;

¹⁴ Pp. 290-294 contains the text of the *Siete Partidas* and the corrections are made from the Gregorio Lopez edition of Madrid, 1789, instead of that of Valladolid, 1587. Cf. *supra*, col. 175.

p. 361, l. 3, gran for grand; p. 362, l. 12, Fl for El; p. 362, three lines from end, 'Madrid, 1855' for 'Madrid, 1859, 1861'; p. 363, l. 10, 134 for 434; p. 363, l. 26, los for les; p. 363, l. 33, com-migo for conmigo; p. 365, l. 2, omit et. In addition it may be said that Agustin Duran's name is systematically written 'Durand' and the *Crónica General* regularly appears as *Crónica Général*.

The following misprints are noted in the 'Glossario': boque for boqua; 'cabando p. 338' for 'cabando p. 339'; 'çienes p. 151' for 'cienes p. 251'; ancomendados for encomendados; 'forrendo p. 167' for 'forrendo p. 267'; a mis guisa for a mi guisa; maravilledes for maravellades; partiemmo for partiemmo; royente for rroyente; sentenciatto for sentenciado. We must probably regard also as misprints the forms ase, cruce, nuose, reale, rede, vese, veze, voze, which are given as the singular forms of ases, cruces, nuoses, redes, etc. The following, previously mentioned as occurring in the texts, are repeated in the vocabulary: cumo for como, juzees for juezes, quelquier for qualquier, faxer for fazer, finchar for finchir, flajamente for flojamente, ligere for ligero, and semos for sennos.

As a closing remark on the typographic inaccuracies of the book, Gorra has used the Italian syllabification not only for Spanish words, but for French and German as well. The result is particularly striking for Spanish where we see // and rr divided, and syllables beginning with impossible combinations of two and three consonants.

Finally, to quote the closing lines of the Preface:

"So che avrei potuto rendere più maneggevole il libro munendone le pagine di titoli correnti, numerandone le linee, rimando per ogni vocabolo al passo in cui esso occorre, ma io mi stimerei troppo fortunato se le mende fossero soltanto tipografiche, e se potessi in qualche modo contribuire a diffondere nel nostro paese la conoscenza di una letteratura verso la quale hanno incominciato a volgere lo sguardo gli studiosi italiani, perchè la sua storia, in certa età, strettamente si connette colla storia delle lettere nostre."

In the light of the facts presented in the foregoing review, what is our estimate of Gorra's book? Judging it in comparison with the author's previous publications, it falls far below

what we had a right to expect of him. The work, to be sure, shows evident traces of haste in its preparation, but, in addition to this, there are many instances where the author has not shown a proper grasp on his subject, while in some cases his method of work is open to serious objections. On the other hand, considering merely what has been done in the same field, the book represents a decided advance, and is certainly destined to be of great service to the student of Spanish philology. The 'Introduzione Grammaticale' forms a well digested treatise, while the texts and vocabulary, in spite of their many defects, contain a mass of information not readily accessible to the beginner.

C. CARROLL MARDEN.

Johns Hopkins University.

ANGLO-SAXON INTRODUCTION.

First Steps in Anglo-Saxon. By HENRY SWEET, M. A., Ph. D., LL. D. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. 1897. 8vo, pp. xii, 108. 2s. 6d.

We have long been familiar with Sweet's method of issuing several books in succession on the same subject, for different classes of students or for students in different stages of development; but the present book has probably come as a great surprise to many Anglo-Saxon scholars. Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Primer* was brought out (in 1882) to serve as a preparation for his *Anglo-Saxon Reader*. It was expressly intended to be "the easiest possible introduction to the study of Old-English." Some students must have complained of the *Primer* even as being too hard; palpable evidence is afforded by Mr. A. J. Wyatt's *Notabilia of Anglo-Saxon Grammar* (The University Tutorial Series, London, 1889), a book embodying explanatory notes and directions with regard to the practical study of the *Primer*. In the Preface to this little volume Mr. Wyatt said:

"Students who have already reached the *A.-S. Reader* are able to walk alone; we have, therefore, with few exceptions, not travelled beyond the *Primer*."

Now the author of the *Primer* himself has come to the aid of the tyro whose faltering

steps need the guidance of a master. *First Steps* is written as an introduction to the *Primer*, and in particular for the benefit of those

"for whom a rigorous grammar-and-glossary method is too abstract, and whose memories will not bear the strain of having to master a grammar of some length before proceeding to the texts."

It is confessedly "a purely practical introduction to the language."

From the Grammar (25 pages), Phonology and Derivation are entirely excluded. The most important syntactical phenomena are mentioned along with the inflectional forms,—a great advantage from the practical point of view. The inflections are not presented in the ordinary 'scientific' arrangement; only the absolutely indispensable paradigms are given, and the principal deviations from the normal scheme are briefly remarked upon. But the grammatical part appears altogether subordinate to the Texts. The learner may almost immediately begin with the reading. Though there is no Glossary, the author has taken pains to explain nearly all words in the Notes, and, besides, by an elaborate system of cross-references has enabled the student to find out for himself all he really needs.

The chief interest of the book centers decidedly in the three groups of Texts. The first contains select sentences from the Old English treatise on astronomy; the second includes Ælfric's *Colloquy* (practically complete). Both have been handled very freely; they are rigidly normalized and otherwise 'improved,' so as to represent 'idiomatic' Old English prose. The third group embraces a lengthy prose paraphrase (twenty-nine pages), by Sweet himself, of the first part of *Bēowulf*, entitled "*Bēowulfes sīþ*." The student has thus the rare pleasure of reading the story of Bēowulf's fights with Grendel and with his mother in strictly 'correct' Old English prose. We have seen, before this, sentences in Old English made up for the purpose of exercises; we have witnessed the translation of an Old English poem (*Judith*) into its original Northumbrian dialect; but no Old English scholar has ever had the courage for such a novel undertaking. The author himself says of his

version: "In this very difficult task I have been more successful than I expected, although I cannot hope entirely to have escaped errors."

A few passages call for a remark.

It is surprising to read that the head of Grendel's mother, together with that of Grendel, is carried triumphantly into Hrōþgār's hall:

"*pā cōm Bēowulf inn-gān on pā healle, and grētte þone cyning. pā wearp Grēndles hēafod be seaxe inn-boren and þære mōdor samod, þām mannum tō wæfersiene. Ealle wundrodon þære seldcūpan gēsihþe.*" (§ 224.)

We can hardly account for this statement, unless *þære idese* (l. 1649) in the original is interpreted as referring to Grendel's mother, which is of course inadmissible. One must also question Sweet's rendering of *ēagena bearhtm* by 'the evil eye' (§ 234):

Nū is þinre geogope blæd tō tȳtelre hwile; sōna hit biþ pæt þē ādl oppe ieldo pines mæġnes benimþ, oppe wæpnes ecg, oppe fȳres feng, oppe flodes wielm, oppe ēagena bearhtm: ne miht þū dēap forflēon! Cf. Bēowulf, 1761 ff.

It may be noted that for *twelf* (so in the *A.-S. Reader* and the *A.-S. Primer*), Sweet writes *twelf* (so also in the *Student's Dictionary*); instead of *se drync* (*drinč*), we find *se drynce* (§§ 71; 87).—Misprints: *hierloom*, § 135 Note; the macron is wanting in *Anne*, § 23; *māra*, § 9 Note; *ānra-gehweht*, § 74 Note; *cynestōl*, § 109 Note.

Who will use this book? There may be students who like a wholly empirical method of learning the elements of the Old English language. This may be especially the case with those who lack the privilege of oral instruction,—and such learners the author seems to have had primarily in view. But there are unquestionably many who prefer by far a more systematic treatment. It is, indeed, difficult to see what advantage there is in withholding from the beginner the classification of the Ablaut verbs and enumerating, instead, in the Notes the stem forms of the verbs, as they occur in the texts, without any attempt at grouping the isolated forms in a system. It is also to be feared that students will get tired of the continual references and cross-references.

There can be no question about the excel-

lence of this book measured by the requirements of scholarship. Every student of Old English can learn a good deal from it. Sincere thanks are due to Dr. Sweet for his indefatigable zeal in providing manuals for the scientific study of the English language. It is only to be questioned whether this elementary Primer will be appreciated by those for whom it is written. It is for the future to determine its place among text-books.

FREDERICK KLAEBER.

University of Minnesota.

WALLENSTEIN'S LAGER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—S. W. Cutting's interpretation of *Wallenstein's Lager* 1096 (see NOTES, June 1897),

Seine Ruhe lässt er an keinem Ort

is scarcely satisfactory. He would construe *seine* with *Ort*—"He leaves no place in undisturbed possession of the peace that belongs to it." In this sense would not German syntax require the dative without *an*? Besides, is not Schiller's thought throughout the entire passage that of the Reiter's restlessness? He has no peace of mind, consequently he can neither impart nor bequeath peace. Carruth's suggestion, quoted by Cutting, seems to me the correct one: "He leaves peace (his peace, like 'My peace I give unto you') nowhere." Only Carruth, in his desire to be concise, said too little. He should have consulted his German bible, and quoted John xiv, 27: "*Den Frieden lasse ich euch; meinen Frieden gebe ich euch.*" The poet is drawing an ironical contrast between the trooper and the Paraclete.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

WALLENSTEIN'S LAGER, l. 1096.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Through your courtesy I have read Professor Hart's objection to my interpretation of Schiller's words:

Seine Ruhe lässt er an keinem Ort,

and call attention, by way of reply, to the following considerations:

1. The German version of John xiv, 27, quoted by Professor Hart, contains the dative without *an*. Schiller's line contains *an*+the dative. I fail, therefore, to detect the appositeness of the quotation, as a means of emphasizing the disparity between Schiller's syntax and my proposed interpretation. Granting a moment, for the sake of argument, that my rendering would call for the dative without *an*, what shall we say of a proposed improvement enforced by quoting a construction equally at variance with that of Schiller?

2. Before publishing my note, I weighed and rejected what seems to me the only serious objection that can be urged against the proposed interpretation. It is this: The possessive pronouns usually refer to nearer, and *dessen*, *deren*, to more remote substantive elements of the German sentence. Hence we might expect to read as a prose equivalent of Schiller's line, if my conjecture as to the meaning be correct: *Er lässt an keinem Orte dessen Ruhe* (since *sein* would refer strictly to *Er*. Cf. Andresen: *Sprachgebrauch und Sprachrichtigkeit im Deutschen*, 7. Aufl., p. 407, and Matthias: *Sprachleben und Sprachschäden*, p. 66 (footnote). While, however, this is true of carefully written prose, the examples quoted by Andresen and Matthias show that even here the possessive pronoun is often used ambiguously instead of *dessen*, *deren*. In poetry this distinction is observed still less sharply. Cf. Schiller's *Wallenstein*, *Prolog*, l. 31, *Tod* iii, 21, l. 47 etc.

3. Now, it is certainly good German to say: *Er lässt etwas an einem Orte [bleiben]* (cf. Sanders: *Wörterbuch d. d. Sp.* ii, p. 33, b, oben), in which case the thing left was by implication there already. Equally idiomatic is the expression applied to boisterous children in a room: *Sie haben nichts an seinem [rechten] Orte gelassen=sie haben alles kunterbunt durcheinander geworfen*. Such reflections leave me still convinced that Schiller's *Seine Ruhe* refers to the peace, the quiet that naturally belongs to a place and remains there, until removed by some disturbing agent, in this case the trooper.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.

University of Chicago.

CORRESPONDANCE INTERNATIONALE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—A System of correspondence between students of French in England and America, and students of English in France, has been inaugurated within the past two years by Professor Mieille, now of the Lycée of Tarbes, Hautes Pyrénées. Several thousand students in England and France are already engaged in it, a few in Canada, and a very few in the United States. So far as known, the only institutions which have entered upon this method of instruction in our own country are Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee, and Swarthmore College, in Pennsylvania. It has been found upon trial to be very inspiring to students of modern languages, and I most cordially commend it to my fellow teachers of French throughout the country. Teachers of German could apply it with equal advantage, and the system is already in operation between France and Germany, but not, so far as I am aware, between Germany and English speaking nations. I have now about thirty of my more advanced students in French engaged in this correspondence. The method pursued may be briefly described as follows:—The first letter is written in the native tongue of the writer, the next in the foreign tongue, and thus indefinitely in alternation. Each letter received that is written in the language of the receiver, is corrected with care and returned to the writer. All letters received are read and made subject of comment in class, that all may receive the benefit of the entire correspondence. By the constant alternation of the letters from the writer's own language to the foreign tongue, correct modes of expression, and usual forms of address, are made familiar to all, and the study of a language is changed from a dry and distasteful form to a living reality. It is indeed a species of foreign travel, inexpensive, efficient and delightful. An incidental, but not unimportant, advantage is the becoming acquainted with various residents in foreign lands, which acquaintance may ripen into intimacy, and become a real advantage and delight when, in later life, the young people thus introduced

cross the ocean, as they are quite sure to do in these days of easy intercommunication.

Teachers wishing to enter upon this delightful department of the labor of teaching a foreign language, if wishing to arrange for French correspondents, will address, for younger students, Messrs. Armand Colin et Cie, 5 rue de Mézières, Paris; and for older students, or for teachers or others of mature age, Prof. Mouchet, Hachette et Cie, Boulevard Saint Germain, 79, Paris. In all cases send both the names and ages of those who wish correspondents, and these well-known firms will promptly attend to the applications.

EDWARD H. MAGILL.

Swarthmore College.

EUGENIE GRANDET.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—My attention has just been drawn to a paragraph of an article on *Eugénie Grandet* in MOD. LANG. NOTES, for June, vol. xii, 1897. The paragraph in question is upon these words: "Ne m'en parle plus, sinon je t'envoie à l'abbaye de Noyers, avec Nanon, voir si j'y suis." The writer of the article, after saying that "the dictionaries seem to afford no help in the matter," adds that "a full explanation of the expression would be interesting."

This calls to mind an anecdote from Tarver's *Life and Letters of Flaubert*, which may have some bearing upon the phrase. It runs as follows:

"The same child who could perceive the absurdities of his father's friends and propose at the age of nine to turn them to literary uses, was easily taken in by the simplest trick. 'Go and see if I am in the kitchen' an old servant would say who found his company inconvenient; and the child would gravely march to the kitchen and repeat, to the mystification of the cook, 'Peter sent me to see if he is here.'"

May not the expression "envoyer voir si j'y suis" be simply an equivalent of our "sending upon a fool's errand," "a wild goose chase?"

MARY K. CHAPIN.

West Philadelphia.

FANGS MEANING TALONS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the *NED.*, Bradley states that the noun *fang*, 'a claw or talon,' seems to rest solely on the authority of the dictionaries, whereupon he cites three dictionaries, the last being Johnson's. Webster's *International* does not refer to this meaning at all. But the word has the meaning of *claw* or *talon*, as appears from the following passage from Seward's *Irrepressible Conflict* speech, delivered at Rochester, October 25, 1858:

"It [the Democratic party] magnifies itself for conquests in foreign lands; but it sends the national eagle forth always with chains, and not the olive branch, in his fangs."

Seward probably had the phrase *within one's fangs*=*within one's clutches* in view, and so applied the former to an eagle as he might have applied the latter. Or else he connected it with the Germanic word *fangen*, as I have heard German-American boys do frequently.

J. H. OTT.

Northwestern University (Wis.).

FRIEDERIKE VON SESENHEIM.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In his excellent edition of Goethe's *Faust*, Intr., p. xxxiii, Professor Calvin Thomas places the age of Friederike Brion at sixteen. This must be an error; P. F. Lucius, pastor at Sesenheim, in his book *Friederike Brion, 1877*, pp. 49 ff., argues at length from data available that she must have been more than eighteen years old when Goethe met her. Düntzer, in his *Goethe's Leben*, 2, 1883, p. 113, says she was in her nineteenth or twentieth year, and Düntzer is usually reliable in such matters. Goethe was then over twenty-one. It is to be hoped that in a future edition Professor Thomas will make the correction; it renders that idyl among Goethe's love affairs less objectionable. In Germany a girl of sixteen is considered still as a child.

VAL. BUCHNER.

Stanford University.